



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 851,353



11
12
13

8 8







ISRAEL AFTER THE FLESH,

THE

JUDAISM OF THE BIBLE,

SEPARATED FROM ITS

SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

BY

WILLIAM HENRY JOHNSTONE, M.A.,

CHAPLAIN OF ADDISCOMBE.



*Οἱ πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν μεταφέρειν πειρωμένοι,
οὐκ ἔξω αἰτιάσεως εἰσὶν Τὰ γὰρ μὴ εἰς αὐτὸν εἰρημένα ἐκβιαζόμενοι,
καὶ τὰ ἀβιάστως εἰρημένα ὑποπτεύεσθαι παρασκευάζουσιν.—ISID. PELUS.*

LONDON :

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCL.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.



TO
MAJOR-GENERAL
SIR EPHRAIM G. STANNUS, C.B.,
LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF THE MILITARY SEMINARY AT ADDISCOMBE,

THIS BOOK IS INSCRIBED,
AS A TOKEN OF ESTEEM,
AND OF GRATITUDE FOR MUCH KINDNESS,
DURING A MINISTRATION OF FIVE YEARS
AMONG THE YOUNG MEN
UNDER HIS COMMAND,
BY HIS OBLIGED AND OBEDIENT SERVANT,
THE AUTHOR.



P R E F A C E.

It is admitted that, while the Old Testament generally expresses Judaism, and the New, Christianity; yet even in the life of Christ there is a considerable portion of the Jewish element; and that the principles of the Gospel were shadowed out, anterior to the existence of the Israelite nation.

These two revelations, sometimes called, in Jeremiah's language, the Old and the New Covenants, seem to cohere so closely, although not coinciding, that it is impossible to thoroughly appreciate either one, without very carefully comparing it with the other.

Under this impression, I searched, among commentators of many ages and schools, for a satisfactory, or even definite account of the two systems. Having discovered how vain was the

search, I felt myself constrained to return to the Bible alone, and endeavour, with God's grace, to find out in what way the dispensations of Moses and Jesus were connected.

Lest it should be thought that the result arrived at was merely a confirmation of prejudice, it may be as well to state, that I began to search for passages which were *said* to promise life eternal to an exact performance of the Law;—the only tolerably distinct idea upon the subject, of which I had ever heard. And it is not easy to describe the curious feeling of surprise I experienced, when I was quite baffled in an attempt to discover even one such passage.

It became clear, after so fruitless an effort, that time would be utterly lost, in stopping to unravel all those finely-woven but warpless textures of Federal Economies;—and that I must, if I desired Truth, proceed by the only method which, in theology as in natural science, is secured from error,—the method of induction. With the help of a Concordance, I examined diligently every part of the Scriptures relating to the Old Covenant; and the principle which has been induced upon these facts, set forth and explained in the course of

the following work, may be briefly stated thus :—

Judaism, or the Old Covenant, of which the Mosaic Law constituted the detailed terms, was exclusively temporal, national, and territorial, confined to the descendants of Israel, and based upon possession of Canaan. It was, at no time, a system of individual justification ; nor had it regard to eternal life. While yet, it could not be perfected, without Christianity co-existing and co-operating.

The first chapter of this book is intended to display some of the facts from which the result has been obtained. It is hoped that the bare statement of what the Bible actually does say of the Old Covenant, may not be found tedious. A reasonable and consistent view of the outward ceremonies, appended to this Covenant, next claimed our notice. The second chapter, exhibiting these ceremonies, as illustrative of my principle, I have called Federal Institutions. A succeeding chapter was required, in order to show what probable ends Judaism was intended to subserve, in preparing the world for the perfect revelation of the Gospel.

It was also of importance that we should

have distinct, and yet correct notions of the way in which the germs of Christianity were contained in the Law of Moses. The fourth and fifth chapters are an attempt to throw light upon this subject.


Having finished the synthetical part of the investigation, it was further essential to demonstrate that the errors which led the Rabbis to reject Christ, and which, down to our own days, have caused the Gospel to be a stumbling-block to the Jews, are due to their having mistaken and forgotten those characteristics of the Law which we have been considering; and that the Judaism of Jesus and of His Apostles can be proved to be an effort to correct this mistake. If I have succeeded in the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters, in making this clear, I conceive that nothing is wanting to a complete inductive proof.

But lastly, having convinced myself (and I trust my readers), that temporal Judaism and spiritual Christianity were designed for mutual support, I could not refrain from dwelling slightly, in a closing chapter, on the hope we may entertain of a restoration of Israel as a theocratic people. In so doing, I am well-aware that I have trodden upon Millennarian

ground;—often unconsciously, since I am not acquainted with the writings of any who have treated of this subject. In the general results, my conclusions are no doubt theirs, however much we may differ in some particulars.

During this inquiry, I am not conscious of having omitted due care and diligence. It has been, for years, my constant prayer to Almighty God, that He would guide me in it. But, inasmuch as infallibility is never promised to any degree, either of devotion or study, it is likely that errors may be discovered in some parts of the book. I shall regard him as my truest friend, who will fairly show where I have mistaken my path. And yet, not being able, on a careful retrospect, to perceive the deviation; and knowing full well that truth has been my only object, it would be the very worst kind of conceit to withhold what I honestly believe to be a very great truth, because I am sensible of my own incapacity for publishing it.

The thought, Who am I? would indeed have prevented my offering this humble work to the world. But every one who is able to speak the truth, and does not speak it, will be condemned by God. Hence I dared not hold my peace. If the communication be vain, it will



perish along with other falsehoods. If true, God will raise up some better, and wiser, and stronger man to proclaim it with more effect.

If my principle is well-founded, that the two Covenants must co-exist and co-operate, in order to the completion of both, I feel assured that there are gigantic intellects, and mighty influences abroad, capable of convincing mankind, not only that the Jew's position in history has been misunderstood, but that the Gospel has been distorted, by the supposition of its having taken the place of the Law.

Whether they or I, whether great or small, serve God, by obeying truth ; to Him alone be the glory ascribed !

Addiscombe, January 1850.

C O N T E N T S.

CHAPTER I.	
The Old Covenant	Page 1
CHAPTER II.	
Federal Institutions	34
CHAPTER III.	
Holiness	71
CHAPTER IV.	
A Future State	105
CHAPTER V.	
The Faith of Israel.....	135
CHAPTER VI.	
Rabbinical Errors	167
CHAPTER VII.	
The Judaism of Jesus.....	207
CHAPTER VIII.	
Christian Jews	240
CHAPTER IX.	
Israel in the Future	280

ISRAEL AFTER THE FLESH.

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD COVENANT.

WE so often meet with the expressions Old Covenant and New Covenant in theological writings, that it is absolutely essential to have a definite understanding of the meaning attached to these words, or men will find themselves disputing about terms, when they imagine they are contending for truths.

The terms themselves are often used, in a loose way, to designate merely the systems introduced respectively by Moses and by Jesus ; although I suppose that the reason why the whole world is agreed to give these names to the two volumes of Scripture, is rather because they contain the two covenants, than that the actual books are the covenants. It happens however unfortunately, that sectarian divines find it often convenient to adduce the authority of Scripture for this general sense of the word, and then, by a common figure of sophistry, to claim that

same authority for their own technical views of the matter.

In order that none of this mischievous confusion may arise in our minds, I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I shall employ the word *covenant* in its proper and grammatical sense, as signifying *a compact, a bargain, or an agreement between two parties, subject to certain conditions*^a. And in this sense it is used by the writers of the Scriptures, for transactions between man and man^b.

Let us assume that the Old Covenant was some compact made between Jehovah on the one part and certain men on the other, proposed and explained in the books of Moses; while the New Covenant is a similar compact proposed in the Gospel.

I know indeed that many pious persons are startled, and even shocked, by the notion of representing God as making a bargain with his creature. But they should remember that it is the representation of Scripture, and is strictly analogous with the constant custom of the Divine oracles, which utter heavenly truths through the intervention of human language;—the only one in fact which men could understand: and certainly this kind of representation is not more strange than the speaking of God as having hands, as repenting, or as taking vengeance^c. It should also not be forgotten, that although God binds man to his part of the covenant, we do not

^a This definition is given by Bishop Hopkins. Introduction to Doctrine of the Two Covenants, vol. ii. p. 302. Edition by J. Pratt, London, 1809.

^b Gen. xxi. 27–32.

^c Psalm cx. 1. Gen. vi. 6. Exod. xx. 5.

presume to speak of binding God. Our confidence that He will be true to His terms does not arise from any right we have to insist on compliance, but simply from our knowledge that He cannot lie. And although God grants blessings to me on certain conditions, I do not dare to say that He does not grant the same or other blessings to some men upon different conditions. God limits me, but His own ways are boundless.

What then was the Old Covenant, so constantly spoken of in the Old Testament; contrasted with the New by Jeremiah^a, and by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews^b?

It is the usual, but an utterly unfounded, conception of the Old Covenant, that "it points out the way, in which, by means of works, salvation is obtained;" that "the form of this covenant is, The man which doeth these things shall live by them, and that in it there is a promise of eternal life, consisting in the immediate fruition of God^c." I do not hesitate to say, that there is not the shadow of an authority for this all but universal view of the Old Covenant. And so sure am I that no one who reads the Bible for himself could ever there find this view, that it might be sufficient to disregard so false an opinion, in spite of the dogmas of its learned supporters, were it not made the very axiom and foundation of the most fatal doctrines. And if, with God's blessing, I succeed in pointing out its fallacy, I trust I shall engage some pious but weak persons to review the whole system

^a Jerem. xxxi. 31-34.

^b Heb. viii. 6-13, ix. 1-28.

^c Witsii *Œconomia Fœderum*, lib. i. cap. 1. § 15.

of their theology, when they see that the very first principles of this theology, put forward by the inventors of it as of unquestionable reality, are proved to be not only hollow, but entirely false.

I need not stop to show how adverse to all our ideas of God it is, to represent him as proposing salvation in mockery to men, by means which never could procure salvation. I shall be content with quoting the words of a great upholder of this notion, which although not intended by him for the purpose, yet so palpably destroy his doctrine of *a divinely originated covenant of works*, that it is wonderful he ever set them down :—" Who can conceive it to be worthy of God to say to man, I am willing that you seek me alone, but on condition that you never find me? I am willing to be earnestly longed for by thee, above all things, with hungering and thirsting after me, but on condition you never be satisfied with me^a."

Neither shall I at present stop to notice the remarkable fact, that in the Pentateuch, which is supposed to promise life eternal on condition of performing the Law, there is no express mention of, and only a few allusions to, eternal life at all.

I ask for proofs of this notion, from the Scripture, and I find that for a principle unquestioned by almost all, but one passage (and that perfectly misunderstood) is brought forward and repeated, as though it met us in every page of the Bible, and as though it was allowable to take one detached passage entirely away from a whole

^a Witsii *Œconomia Fœderum*, lib. i. cap. 1. § 11.

chain of a logical argument, to forget all about the argument itself, and to give to two or three words a meaning, which, I venture to say, never entered into the writer's mind.

This one authority for a covenant of works is this: "The man that doeth these things shall live by them^a." But so far from the apostle Paul intending in the places where these words occur, to assert that the doctrine of a covenant of works could be found in the old Scriptures, the whole gist of his argument is, that even the Law implied justification by faith^b, in direct opposition to those Jews who sought in the Scriptures for the very doctrine which modern theologians assert that they find there. And in order to remove all doubt as to the righteousness, and the blessings, of the Old Covenant, St. Paul says, that he who obeys that covenant shall only get the blessings of that covenant, which we shall presently see were not life eternal. Therefore he quotes the book of Leviticus^c, "If a man keep my statutes and judgements, he shall live in them;" that is, shall obtain the life promised for the observance of those precepts, not the life promised to faith^d. Upon this one passage, made to mean the very opposite to what St. Paul evidently meant, is raised the complicated structure of God proposing to man a covenant of works, or of offering to save man, if man would do what it was quite impossible for him to do.

^a Witsii *Æcon. Fœd. lib. i. cap. 1. § 15.* See Rom. x. 5, and Gal. iii. 12.

^b Rom. x. 6-11, and Gal. iii. 11.

^c Lev. xviii. 5.

^d See Whitby's note on Rom. x. 5, who quotes Origen as giving the above interpretation; and Rosenmüller on Lev. xviii. 5.

And then, in order to make the sophistry more perplexing, the covenant, of which the laws of Moses are the exponents, is mixed up with a pretended covenant made with Adam the federal head of the human race. Concerning this covenant it may be sufficient to say, that no proof whatever is offered from the Scriptures for it; and it would be therefore useless to disprove that which is only asserted. The foolish pretence of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the first sabbath, being sacraments belonging to that covenant^a, is manifestly a mere invention, and may be dismissed without farther consideration. I do not say that there was no covenant made with Adam: all I contend for is, that no single line of the Scriptures makes even the most distant allusion to a covenant of works being made with him. We are not concerned with anything merely imaginable. We have our hands upon God's own declared word, and must not allow any follies of learned men to make that word of none effect to us. The covenant always mentioned in both volumes of the Bible, is the covenant made between God and the people of Israel; and no one has any right to take passages referring most palpably to that covenant, and apply them to another covenant nowhere mentioned at all^b.

^a Witsii *Econ. Fœd.* lib. i. cap. 6. See also Bishop Hopkins's Discourses on the Law.

^b This is done by more than one writer; as when the curses pronounced by Moses to the Israelites, at Deut. xxvii. 26, are made to be uttered against the infringement of a covenant of works, supposed to have been offered to man in Paradise.—Witsii *Econ. Fœd.* lib. i. cap. 3. § 24; and Bishop Hopkins, 2nd Discourse on the Law.

When I commenced this investigation, I confess I did so with the vague impression that the Old Covenant meant an engagement entered into, wherein God promised to give life and immortality on condition of performing the whole Law. But when, disregarding human theories, I looked into the Bible, I discovered (and I do not hesitate to say I was startled by the discovery) that the Old Covenant, everywhere spoken of in both the Old and the New Testaments, which, when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, was “ready to vanish away^a,” was, in plain words, nothing of the kind.

That covenant had nothing whatever to do with eternal life (except by way of type or suggestion); it had nothing whatever to do with any, except with the nation of Israel; and nothing whatever with any mere individual in that nation. It was made with the nation collectively, and was entirely temporal. God promised to give the land of Canaan to the nation of Israel; only so long as the nation collectively acknowledged Jehovah as the One God.

The first account we have of this covenant is in the book of Genesis, when God called Abram from his father's house, and said, “Unto thy seed will I give this land^b,” namely Canaan. This promise was renewed at different seasons of Abraham's life, and repeated to Isaac and Jacob^c. It was looked forward to by their descendants as a hope of deliverance during their sojourn in Egypt^d. When at length the nation set forth to take

^a Heb. viii. 13.

^b Gen. xii. 7.

^c Gen. xiii. 14–17, xvii. 1–8, xxii. 16, 17, xxvi. 3–5, xxviii. 3, 4.

^d Gen. i. 24.

possession of their inheritance, the covenant was more formally and solemnly proclaimed, at the very commencement of the journey^a.

If the passages here referred to be inspected, it will appear certain that the covenant spoken of was strictly such as our definition has made it to be—a mutual compact, subject to conditions. The terms on God's part were, that He would make the nation possess, and be lords over, the land of Canaan; the terms on the part of Israel were, that it would acknowledge Jehovah alone as God. In the case of the forefathers of the nation, the fact of such an acknowledgement is taken for granted, and indeed forms the very basis of the agreement. When circumcision was appointed, the sign of the covenant, God required Abraham to walk before Him and be perfect^b. At the renewal of the covenant with Isaac, the requisition of obedience to Jehovah, as the qualifying terms, appears more evident:—"I will perform the oath, which I swear unto Abraham thy father; . . . because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws^c."

As the history proceeds, the nature of this mutual agreement becomes still more intelligible. At the very time when God was detailing to Moses, up in the mount, the laws connected with the covenant, the people were beginning to show symptoms of an inclination to infringe the terms. And when Moses interceded for the guilty people, and besought God that He would not abolish the covenant which Israel had so nearly broken, but

^a Exod. xix. & xx.

^b Gen. xvii. 1.

^c Gen. xxvi. 3-5.

that He would still take them for His inheritance^a, the whole matter is declared much more explicitly:—"Behold, I make a *covenant*: before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation; and all the people among which thou art shall see the work of the Lord: for it is a terrible thing that I will do with thee. Observe thou that which I command thee this day: behold I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be a snare in the midst of thee: but ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: for thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God^b." Nothing can make it more clear that the covenant between Jehovah and Israel (with which alone we have to do) was such as we have defined it to be. Jehovah engages to drive out the idolatrous people, and establish the children of Israel in their place, by a continued exhibition of miracles, *if* Israel would have no other god but Him. And it is to be remarked how carefully the covenant is worded, so as to put beyond a doubt that it was made with the nation collectively; which is therefore addressed in the singular number; except where the particular acts of the individuals are specified, when the plural number is used (verse 13).

^a Exod. xxxiv. 9.

^b Exod. xxxiv. 10-14.

Throughout the books of Moses, this compact between Jehovah and Israel is continually repeated. But it is chiefly in the book of Deuteronomy that we are to look for it; because this portion, containing a reiteration in order of all the laws scattered over the three preceding books, and being moreover the parting charge of the lawgiver to his nation, we may naturally expect greater precision of language and clearness of argument here, than where the laws are introduced casually, as they occurred, and are interspersed with the history.

In the sixth chapter of this book, after the declaration of the Law of the tables, it is said: "Hear, therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it, (namely to keep the law,) that it may be well with *thee*; and that *ye* may increase mightily, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee, in the land that floweth with milk and honey. Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And it shall be, when the Lord thy God shall have brought thee into the land which he sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not then beware lest thou forget the Lord, which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name. Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you; (for the Lord *thy* God is a jealous God among

you) lest the anger of the Lord thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth ^a.”

The same thing is repeated in almost every succeeding chapter of this book ^b. And in order that no doubt may by any possibility remain that this covenant was precisely a compact or bargain; that Jehovah would always perform his part when the nation performed its part; and only upon that condition; I would refer the reader to the thirtieth chapter of this last-quoted book, where he will see it very expressly declared, that when the nation should be driven out of the land, in consequence of the national violation of the covenant, yet that even then God would return to his terms, if the nation should repent and turn to the Lord:—“And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land, which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law, and if thou turn unto the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul ^c.”

When Moses was concluding his parting words, for the purpose of preventing any misconception of the matter, he announced, even more precisely than before, the nature of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel. “See,” said he, “I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and

^a Deut. vi. 3–15.

^b See especially xxvi. 16–19, and the whole of chapter xxviii.

^c Deut. xxx. 1–10.

to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgements, that thou mayest live and multiply : and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away and worship other gods, and serve them ; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing : therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live : that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him : for he is thy life, and the length of thy days : that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob to give them ^a.”

Nor is it only in the books of Moses that this temporal and national character of the Old Covenant is plainly set forth. The same appears in every other part of the Bible, when the *Old* Covenant is literally referred to. It would be needless to multiply examples. The following will be sufficient to direct honest inquiry.

In the 105th Psalm, the writer is exhorting his own people to a thankful remembrance of God's bounty :—
“He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac ; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to

^a Deut. xxx. 15–20.

Israel for an everlasting covenant : saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance ^a." And farther on, in the same Psalm : " He brought forth his people with joy, and his chosen with gladness ; and gave them the lands of the heathen, and they inherited the labour of the people ; that they might observe his statutes and keep his laws ^b."

Isaiah, also, while speaking of the judgements coming upon Israel, in consequence of the infringement of this covenant, says, " The land shall be utterly emptied and utterly spoiled : for the Lord hath spoken this word. The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away ; the haughty people of the earth do languish. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof ; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant ^c."

Jeremiah, who was especially the prophet of the Old Covenant, speaks perpetually the same language ^d. In that well-known passage where he predicts the New Covenant being made when the Old should be broken, " Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah ; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt ; which my covenant they brake ^e."

These quotations will be sufficient from the Old Testament, to show what the Old Covenant was. At present

^a Psalm cv. 8-11.

^b vv. 43-45.

^c Isaiah xxiv. 3-5.

^d See especially chapters vii. and xi.

^e Jer. xxxi. 31, 32.

I shall not refer particularly to the New Testament, because this part of my subject will have to be considered when I come to treat of the obedience rendered to the Old by the preachers of the New Covenant^a. But to speak generally, I would ask what meaning is there attached to those passages of the New Testament, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews^b, wherein the promises of the New are said to be better than those of the Old; if the promise in the Old was also life eternal?

I fear indeed that the selections I have made may seem tedious to many persons; and I may be blamed for insisting upon what is evident to every one. But if this sense is *so* evident to others, (as it certainly is to me,) whence, I again ask, can any one obtain authority for a Divinely proposed Covenant of works, promising everlasting life?

Many other similar passages might be adduced, were it necessary to do so; but if we search throughout the whole of the Scriptures, no other idea of the Old Covenant will ever present itself, than the one I am endeavouring to exhibit. Its promises and sanctions were altogether temporal, and concerned the collected nation of Israel only^c.

^a See Chap. VIII. of this work.

^b Heb. viii. 6.

^c All writers conversant with the Laws of Moses are aware of their *national* character. Maimonides declares that "The Law was accommodated to the whole nation collectively, not to individuals" (*Moreh Nevochim*, iii. 34).

And Lowman: "When we consider this plan of ritual worship, we have another remark, which offers itself, that it is the ritual of a national, and not a personal worship." (*Ritual of the Hebrew Worship*, Part ii. chap. 4.)

Generally speaking, the nation was required to serve and obey all the precepts which Jehovah enjoined, which precepts in their entire form are called the Law. In the book of Genesis^a, where the covenant was solemnly entered into with the patriarch of the nation, and it was said, "This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised;" we are not to suppose that by the people being circumcised, the covenant was kept; although the modern Jews perversely commit the mistake of calling circumcision the covenant^b, and Christian writers sometimes imitate their phraseology^c. But it is clear that nothing else is meant in the Scriptures than that circumcision was "the token of the covenant^d," that Israel was circumcised, to denote its being in covenant with God; but of course if Israel did not observe the terms (acknowledgement of Jehovah) although circumcised, yet the covenant was infringed. Circumcision, in fact, marked a person *entitled* to the privileges of the

^a Gen. xvii. 10.

^b The modern Jews at the rite of circumcision invite the attendance of Elijah, because they pretend that in consequence of the prophet having once complained that the people neglected it, God promised that he should always be present to see it duly performed. The complaint alluded to is said to be found at 1 Kings xix. 10:—"the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant;" that is, say the Rabbis, have neglected circumcision.

Part of the ceremony of circumcision consists in giving thanks to God for remembering his covenant.

See Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. cap. 4; Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. 16; and Lightfoot's Harmony on Acts xxi.

^c Vide Grotius de Veritate Rel. Christ. lib. v. cap. 11.

^d Gen. xvii. 11.

covenant ; it did not necessarily follow that every circumcised person made good his title, or received the privileges. When the nation left Egypt to enter upon the inheritance, all the people were circumcised ; whereas those born in the wilderness were not so. When Joshua led them across the Jordan, that is, when God was about to establish the covenant, it was discovered that the former had all died, while the latter only remained alive. The covenant therefore was really established with those who were uncircumcised, but had obeyed the voice of the Lord ; it was refused to those, who, although circumcised, yet were a stiff-necked generation. At the same time, on these persons who thus received an earnest of the covenant, because they hearkened to Jehovah, the sign was affixed, to denote that they were *introduced* to the covenant^a.

The entire Law, as detailed in the last four books of the Pentateuch, was the condition of covenant, not the covenant itself. And it is necessary to insist very strongly upon this distinction, in order to avoid some mischievous practical consequences. A great deal of that law is immutable right, perfectly independent of the covenant made with Israel, in no way affected by the establishment, or by the cessation, of that covenant. And yet it is clear that antinomianism arises from not attending to this. In the very mildest and least offensive form of this dangerous error, we may always detect the confusion between the law and the covenant. The self-constituted saint, perceiving that the Old Covenant has no claims upon

^a Joshua v. 2-9.

those who are strangers to the family of Abraham, impiously concludes that God's unchanging rule of right and wrong has been reversed, and that the law does not regard the spiritually free.

But there is moreover another very important consideration ; the law *of the covenant*, being proposed to the collected nation, was to be observed, not by inward spiritual faith, but by outward profession ; which is indeed the only obedience a nation, as such, can render. And although every minor offence should go towards making up *at last* the national violation of the covenant, yet the nation should not be counted as having finally and irretrievably ceased from its title to the land of Canaan, until it broke that commandment, which is the hinge upon which the whole law turns—*Thou shalt have no other God but Jehovah*. From our Lord's decision^a, no less than from the whole of the Scriptures, it is clear that the first commandment was that upon which all the Law and the prophets depended^b ; that, in fact, obedience to no one command was a virtue at all, except when based upon love to God. And although it may be too much

^a Matt. xxii. 40.

^b So too Maimonides :—"The foundation of our complete law, and the hinge upon which it turns, is the destruction of those opinions (namely the heathen notions of God) and the eradication of the memory of them." And again, "Whoever professes idolatry should be considered as one who rejected the whole law ; and whoever rejects idolatry, as one who professed the whole law." (Moreh Nevochim, iii. 29.)

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the learned Rabbi commits the traditionary mistake of applying what is meant for the whole nation to an individual ; notwithstanding his own decision to the contrary (iii. 34).

to say that the decalogue, the digest or argument of the whole law, is arranged in an exact order of importance, so that any one commandment depends upon the one preceding, and is included in it; yet we can have no doubt that they are all but consequences of the "great commandment of the law," which, for this reason, is constantly put to represent all the rest. And we also know that the sin of the second commandment, or that of image worship, is always spoken of as the greatest of all sins, after actual rejection of Jehovah.

Hence therefore it was that the first commandment was taken as a test. Although every smaller sin would *lead towards* the cessation of the covenant; yet God, who never proposes to man what man cannot fulfill, would not consider the covenant at an end, irreversibly, until the *whole* law was set at nought, or Jehovah was publicly and nationally rejected. And we shall presently see, that although many temporal miseries came upon Israel for smaller sins, yet the nation was not actually ejected from the land until it had professedly refused obedience to Jehovah.

It is for this reason, doubtless, that God is never represented as angry, jealous, or indignant, except for infringement of the first commandment, which was the whole law; or sometimes of the second, which was only one step lower in the scale of sins^a.

^a Exod. xxxiv. 14. Deut. vi. 14, 15; xi. 16, 17; xxxi. 29; xxxii. 21; and also Exod. xx. 5. It is probable that the threats joined to the second commandment are in reality intended for the first and second conjointly.

This reason, moreover, will satisfactorily clear up a difficulty which perplexes all who look into the Scriptures. Infidels are wont to cavil at the expression of "visiting the children with the iniquities of the fathers," or as Jeremiah and Ezekiel figuratively write, "setting the children's teeth on edge for the sour grapes which their fathers have eaten^a."

The only answer which Christian writers generally make to this pretended discovery of injustice, is that God may exercise this right of imputation of sin from one man to another, although the same cannot be said of any but the Creator^b. I confess that there still seems some lack of equity in this; and although I would not dare to murmur at such an arrangement, if it were really proved to be made by God, yet there is certainly *proof required* that God is ever said to impute *sins* from one person to another; except with reference to the national infringement of the national covenant. In fact, the expression means simply this: If the generality of the nation break the covenant, every individual, even though obedient and pious, shall be involved in the curse; that is, deprived of the temporal blessings.

That this is the true view of the matter will be evident, if it is considered that this imputation of sin is *never*

^a Jer. xxxi. 29. Ezek. xviii. 2.

^b The question is discussed in Warburton's *Divine Legation*, book v. sect. 5, and appendix, note CC;—in Michaelis' *Laws of Moses*, book v. art. 229; and in Magee on the Atonement, note 42.

Michaelis indeed makes an attempt to clear up the difficulty, by suggesting that this imputation may refer to the affliction of leprosy. But as he offers no proof, we may regard the notion as an ingenious fancy.

mentioned, except for the sin either of the first or of the second commandment ; that is, only for actual violation of the covenant^a ; or for image worship, the sin which in most cases led at once to denial of Jehovah^b.

Jeremiah, in predicting a New Covenant, says that the distinction between it and the Old should be, that whereas formerly the children were punished for their parents' faults, now every one should bear his own transgression^c. In other words, that whereas in the Old Covenant, when the nation was punished, every individual, though not himself sinful, should share the punishment ; in the New, the dealings between God and man should be *individual* ; or, any one's transgressions should bring punishment only to himself. Jeremiah, living at the time when the nation was actually undergoing the punishment for the national sin ; and when many pious men, who had never bowed the knee to Baal, were carried away captive to Babylon with the rest of the people ; more than once refers to this imputation for the particular sins above specified ; *but for no others*. More especially in the last chapter of the Lamentations, where he represents the people mourning for being detained captive in consequence of the rebellion of the preceding generation : "Our fathers have sinned, and are not, and we have borne their iniquities^d."

^a Exod. xxxiv. 7. Lev. xx. 5 ; xxvi. 39. Numb. xiv. 18. 1 Kings xxi. 29. Isaiah lxxv. 7, &c.

^b Exod. xx. 5. As we said before, the curses belong to the first and second commandments conjointly.

^c Jer. xxxi. 29, 30.

^d Lam. v. 7. See also Ezek. xviii., who contends against this very error of making the imputation of sins for individual sins.

I would not be supposed to question, with rash impiety, the equity of all that God is *proved* to do. It is certain that God's temporal visitations often sweep away, *apparently*, the innocent with the guilty. But I do most earnestly lift up my voice against the ignorant presumption of certain sectarians, who boldly declare that, it being God's universal rule to attribute sin from one man to another, he is only represented *by themselves* as carrying out this rule by condemning men everlastingly for others' sins.

Every one must at once perceive the fundamental difference between God threatening in the Bible to involve individuals in the temporal punishment coming upon the whole nation, for the national violation of the covenant; and God threatening, in theological writings, to involve one man in everlasting misery because another man has sinned.

Let us therefore be quite clear upon the point we are establishing. The Old Covenant which God made with Israel was, that He would retain them in possession of the land of Canaan, on condition that they would *nationally* keep his statutes and his judgements; that various temporal afflictions would come upon them, if they departed from these conditions; but they should not be held to have actually broken the covenant, and should not therefore lose the land, until they had openly, and nationally, rejected Jehovah from being their God.

This is evident from the passages selected above for that purpose; and if additional evidence is required to the same effect, it will be found in almost every page of

the Bible. But, as a confirmation of what has been advanced, it will be useful to go through the national history, and trace in the various fortunes of Israel, the palpable, though slighted truth, that however much God punished the people in other ways, yet He never departed from His terms until the people had broken theirs ; that they *never* lost the land unless they actually rejected Jehovah ; but that invariably when the nation, collectively, served other gods, then it was ejected and exiled. And I solemnly invite the reader to get rid of the notion of God once proposing a covenant of works, and then revoking it arbitrarily. I call upon every Christian man to study how and by whom this covenant has been broken. Let him see how the Creator, whose most essential attribute is unchangeableness, did always keep to his terms when Israel acknowledged Him as its God. He did not cast out Israel from Palestine, until He was rejected : He has always restored them when they returned to Him. And any other view than this does certainly represent Jehovah as proposing a law which could not be kept, or as instituting a covenant which He infringed himself^a.

The patriarchs who represented in person the future nation, were some of them guilty of many sins ; and yet as they never ceased to acknowledge Jehovah, or kept to

^a The prophet Isaiah thus represents God as declaring to the people, that the rejection of Israel, or as he figuratively calls it, the divorcement of their mother, was attributable only to themselves, not to God. "Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away." (L. 1.)

their terms of agreement, Jehovah observed His ; He did not even threaten them with a holding back of the promise. Their descendants in Egypt and in the wilderness were eminently a stiff-necked and rebellious people, always sinning and always provoking the Lord to anger ; and yet it is very remarkable that they just kept themselves from violating the covenant ; they did never nationally and professedly serve other gods.

If this can be established in the matter of their two greatest offences, the Calf at Horeb, and the sin at Baal-Peor, no one will question its truth in any smaller transgression.

Although it is a vulgar notion that the worship of the Molten Calf was a bowing down to a strange god, yet I believe that most persons who have carefully studied the account are agreed that the sin consisted, not in paying worship to a false god, but in making a material representation of Jehovah himself. It was an infringement, not of the first, but of the second commandment^a.

For it ought to be particularly noticed that the request of the Israelites is couched in these terms : " Up, make us gods, which shall go before us ; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him^b." They desired the image, therefore, to take the place, not of Jehovah, but of

^a " Igitur Israelitæ non ipsum simulacrum pro Deo habebant, sed peccabant in eo, quod violabant legem illam (Exod. xx. 4) de Deo nequaquam sub imagine aliquâ adorando." Rosenmüller, Scholia in Exod. xxxii. 4. See also Michaelis' Laws of Moses, book v. art. 245 ; and especially Warburton's Divine Legation, book v. sect. 2.

^b Exod. xxxii. 1.

Moses whom they supposed they had lost. Moses had hitherto been the mediator between them and Jehovah; and they now felt the want of something else to come between them and the great God, whom their carnal minds could not worship as He insists on being worshiped, in spirit, and as a Spirit. And Aaron, in complying with their request, was understood by them to give something in the place of Moses, whom they particularly mentioned as having brought them up out of the land of Egypt: For, said they, "these be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt^a." Moreover, it is clear that in bowing down before the molten image, they intended to worship Jehovah through it, because the proclamation of Aaron was, "Tomorrow is a feast to the LORD" (that is, to Jehovah, as it is in the original^b). Then again their mode of worship, the making of a peace-offering, had just been instituted by Moses for the service of Jehovah, and was unknown in the rites of any other religion than the Levitical^c.

Hence, this sin of the molten calf, although an exceedingly aggravated one, and although committed by the entire nation, did not amount to a rejection of Jehovah; and therefore the covenant was not yet quite broken.

In the matter of the offence at Beal-Peor, there can be

^a Exod. xxxii. 4.

^b Verse 5. I cannot understand why, here as well as elsewhere, our translators have imitated the superstitious regard for the mere word Jehovah, which the Septuagint Jews, in common with the whole nation, entertained. A great deal of the meaning of the Bible is lost, because the Greek *ὁ Κύριος* and the English LORD have been substituted for the proper name Jehovah.

^c Verse 6. For proof of this, see the next chapter of this book.

no question that *some* of the people did pay adoration to a strange god. They broke the first commandment. Yet it is very evident, from the relation, that the offence was not a *national* one; it was not committed by the majority of the nation; or by the responsible rulers; because all who were concerned in it were put to death; and the chief men executed the orders of Moses: therefore "Moses said unto the *judges* of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-Peor^a."

So that up to the time of God's putting the children of Israel into possession of Canaan, they had not broken the covenant, and therefore He fulfilled His terms. He gave to them the good land, as He had promised.

In the time of the Judges, the nation did very frequently break the covenant. They served Baal, and Ashtaroth, and the other gods of the Gentiles. And in every case where they did so, then God revoked his promise. The covenant, for the time, was in abeyance. Wherever it is said that the people did evil in the sight of the Lord, by worshiping strange gods, then also it is declared how God took from them the dominion of Palestine, and sold them into the hands of their enemies. And these afflictions are therefore accounted by Jewish writers as some of the captivities of the nation. But then we must not fail to take particular notice that He always restored them when they repented. How often is it repeated that, whenever the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to them^b!

^a Numb. xxv. 5.

^b See especially Judges ii. 11-20, iii. 7-15, iv. 1-24, vi. 1-10, x. 6-16, &c.

From the time of Samuel, for a considerable period, there is no mention made of an infringement of the *national* covenant. The people, as a nation, did not serve strange gods; they abided by the worship of Jehovah.

Solomon indeed, in his old age, was seduced by his foreign concubines to build high places for Ashtoreth and Milcom, for Chemosh and Molech, the abominations of the surrounding heathens. But the nation seems to have had little to do with the sin; it was Solomon's own, and so was the punishment. The people were not deprived of their right as land-owners of Canaan; but the kingdom was rent from Solomon's family^a.

The nation was divided into two separate kingdoms, the *national* fortunes of which were distinct. The southern kingdom, called by the name of its chief tribe Judah, preserved its allegiance to the family of David; while the northern, which, on account of its greater extent, arrogated the title of Israel, or which was often known by the name of Ephraim, its principal tribe, adhered to the rebel Jeroboam, and his successors.

Let us first attend to the history of the ten tribes, since they preceded their brethren in the course of iniquity.

There can be no doubt that when Jeroboam set up the calves at Dan and at Bethel, the two extremes of his kingdom, he did not intend to leave Jehovah^b, but to

^a 1 Kings xi. 1-13.

^b "Jeroboam appointed two places for Divine service, within his own territories, in which no doubt the true God *was* worshiped."—Michaelis' *Laws of Moses*, book v. art. 245. See also Hengstenberg's *Christology*,—Preliminary Observations on Hosea.

worship Him under the semblance of an image. In the first place, it is remarkable that Jeroboam appears to have imitated very closely the calf which the Israelites had made at Horeb; and that he uses precisely the same words as they had done: "Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt^a." Moreover his sin is mentioned as having consisted, not in what was worshiped, but in the circumstances of the worship. The not going up to Jerusalem, and the making of priests not from the tribe of Levi^b, would scarcely be made so prominent, if he had designed to worship a strange god; for no circumstances could aggravate that offence. But they are necessarily mentioned and insisted on, when indeed they constituted the offence itself. Then again the sin of Ahab, who introduced the worship of other gods, is spoken of as much more heinous than the sin of Jeroboam who set up images:—"Ahab, the son of Omri, did evil in the sight of the Lord, *above all that were before him*. And it came to pass, as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, that he took to wife Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal and worshiped him^c." Jeroboam's sin was therefore something less than Ahab's sin. So also when Jehu, with great zeal, and with the approbation of Jehovah, exterminated the worshipers of Baal: "howbeit from the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat,

^a Compare 1 Kings xii. 28 with Exod. xxxii. 4.

^b 1 Kings xii. 28-33.

^c 1 Kings xvi. 30-33.

who made Israel to sin, Jehu departed not from after them, to wit, the golden calves that were in Bethel, and that were in Dan^a."

So that there can be no doubt that Jeroboam infringed the second, not the first commandment: the national covenant was not completely violated.

Ahab worshiped other gods than Jehovah; and although doubtless the nation was becoming deeply contaminated with idolatry, yet it seems as if it took some generations for the evil to spread so far as to amount to a national violation of the covenant. Ahab and his family were obliged to have recourse to a very tyrannical government to support the establishment of Baalim and the groves^b. And when Jehu arose, with the published intention of destroying the abominations of Jezebel^c, the people generally were glad to join him. And had he been perfect, had he destroyed the images, as well as restored the worship of Jehovah, it is probable that the national course of iniquity might have been checked; but from image worship to denial of the one God, the descent is so easy, and the nation was so much imbued with the evil, that they gradually, almost with one consent, fell off into the worship of the gods of the heathen.

The family of Jehu most probably were as zealous as himself in cleaving to Jehovah; and therefore, although none of them departed from the sins of the house of Jeroboam, up to this time the Lord "had respect unto

^a 2 Kings x. 28, 29.

^b 1 Kings xviii. 13.

^c 2 Kings ix. 22.

them, *because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast he them from his presence* AS YET^a.”

It is not improbable that the worship of Jehovah, through the calves, continued to be the established religion of Israel during the remainder of the time that the kingdom lasted. But it was only a form,—there remained the grove in Samaria^b. The nation was thoroughly corrupted with strange gods, when Hoshea, the last and most wicked of all the kings, consummated the national depravity^c; and now, when the covenant was finally broken, God permitted the king of Assyria to put an end to the dominion which the ten tribes had held over the northern division of Palestine. The reason why God permitted this is very expressly stated :—“ For so it was, that the children of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God, which had brought them up out of the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt; and had feared other gods, and walked in the statutes of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel, and of the kings of Israel, which they had made. And the children of Israel did secretly those things that were not right against the Lord

^a 2 Kings xiii. 23 and xiv. 27.

^b 2 Kings xiii. 6.

^c When Hoshea is said to have done evil in the sight of the Lord, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him (2 Kings xvii. 2), I see no warrant for the conclusion jumped at by most commentators, that “ he hath, as to religion, the best character given him in Scripture of all that reigned before him over Israel from the division of the kingdom.” (Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 729.) The opinion of Josephus (Antiq. ix. 13) is much more probable, that “ he was a wicked man, and a despiser of the Divine worship.”

their God, and they built them high places in all their cities. . . . And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers ; . . . and made a grove, and worshiped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire (that is, they worshiped Moloch), and used divinations and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the Lord, and to provoke him to anger. Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight^a."

And so notorious was the fact that the nation of the ten tribes was destroyed, because they had not followed Jehovah, that the mixed race which replaced them took notice of it ; and in order to avoid (as they thought) the same punishment, reckoned Jehovah among their gods^b.

The kingdom of the two tribes lasted longer. Yet the same things occurred in nearly the same order. Ahaz and Manasseh were infamous for deserting the service of Jehovah. It will be observed, however, that in the time of Ahaz, the nation do not seem to have generally fallen along with the king into the worship of strange gods. In the whole account of the transgression of Ahaz, there is no mention of the people sinning^c. Whereas in the time of Manasseh, it is particularly declared that he made Judah also to sin^d ; and it is also stated that the Lord poured out his wrath on Judah, because of the provoca-

^a 2 Kings xvii. 7-18.

^b 2 Kings xvii. 24-41.

^c See 2 Kings xvi. and 2 Chron. xxviii.

^d 2 Kings xxi. 9-11 and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 9, 10.

tion of Manasseh^a, who was distinguished from the other kings by not only himself leaving Jehovah (like his grandfather), but by seducing the nation with success to leave Him also.

Although the personal piety of Hezekiah and Josiah arrested the final execution of the sentence, yet when it was certain that the nation was thoroughly corrupted, the king of Babylon was raised up to take from them the dominion of Judea; in other words, the national covenant was at an end.

When the Lord denounced woes to Jerusalem, by the mouth of Jeremiah, he declared, "Many nations shall pass by this city, and they shall say every man to his neighbour, Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this great city? Then they shall answer, *Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord their God, and worshiped other gods, and served them*^b."

For this reason the nation underwent the Babylonish captivity during two generations of men. But it fell out that the nation repented. Whether from the warnings of their own prophets, or the sufferings inflicted on them by the *idolatrous* Chaldæans, or the example of the Persians, who were singularly distinguished from other Gentiles, by being Monotheists^c; yet from that time to

^a 2 Kings xxiii. 26.

^b Jeremiah xxii. 8, 9. The prophet Jeremiah, living at the time of the violation of the Old Covenant; and having as his especial burden, the declaring to the people why they were afflicted; very often speaks of the Lord withholding his terms of agreement, *because* the people had violated theirs.—See v. 19, vii. 29–31, &c.

^c See Michaelis' Laws of Moses, ii. 32.

this, the Jews *seem* to have been remarkable for never returning to the sin of their fathers.

After their return from Babylon, the Jews were the inhabitants and proprietors of Canaan for about five centuries. It was 1800 years ago that they were again chased from the land by the Romans, and they have never since returned to it. And why? How is it that this people have been cast out of the land, when God engaged, upon his own truth, to give it them, so long as they did not reject Him? If they have adhered with such astonishing firmness, through persecution and temptation, to Jehovah only; has God forgotten his own truth? Did he bear long with their rebellions, when they were rebellious? And is it in consequence of their religiously observing the covenant, that He has now poured out the vials of his wrath upon them; and made them to be wanderers over the whole earth, and a by-word and a reproach among the Gentiles? In other words, does any one accuse God of having broken his own covenant?

That be far from us! In Him there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. God would not have rejected them, had they not rejected Him.

They did reject Jehovah, when He visited them in great humility; when they cried out, We will not have Him to reign over us. They did, when they stood before Pilate's Prætorium, invoke upon themselves the consequences of rejecting Him. From that day to this, in spite of *individual* conversions, the *nation* is obstinately set upon thrusting from them the Son of God; they

show no signs of repenting ; they are not permitted to re-occupy the land.

I call upon the Jew, into whose hands this book may possibly come. I call upon him, with affectionate seriousness, as professing to believe in the same God and in the same Scriptures that I do, to explain, if he can, why his nation is thus outcast. It avails not to reply that his nation is punished for its sins ; because only one sin, professed refusal to serve Jehovah, is specified, for which God threatened to cast them out. And if he insists that Jesus of Nazareth was not God, then he insists that his nation have not rejected God ; and that therefore God is not true^a.

^a This argument is usually lost sight of in the controversy with the Jews.—(See Leslie's *Short and Easy Method with the Jews*.) It is useless to tell a Jew that he is punished for rejecting Jesus, and for that reason Jesus must be the Messiah. He will point with triumph to the oracles of God, and maintain with truth that God has never plainly threatened ejection from the land because of any spurning of the Messiah ; and therefore that it does not follow they have spurned the Messiah. But it does follow that they must have rejected Jehovah, because loss of the land was threatened only for such a rejection.

It is clear that this argument applies equally to the Socinian as to the Jew. If Jesus was not Jehovah, in what way have the Jews rejected Jehovah ?

CHAPTER II.

FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS.

WHEN the Old Covenant was made between God and Israel, there were certain signs appointed, in order to mark its existence and preserve the national peculiarity; or, on the other hand, to exhibit an *individual* Israelite at one time as sharing in the national blessings, and at another time as excluded from them.

The first of these stands *circumcision*, expressly called the token of the covenant. It was a mark set upon every one, who by birth or adoption was *introduced* to a share in the privileges of the covenant. It must, however, not be forgotten, that it was only an initial ceremony. It did not necessarily follow that a circumcised man should remain in covenant (as we have before seen at page 16); for no Israelite could be in covenant, except during the period that the entire nation observed the prescribed terms. But then, each individual, by his own transgressions, would tend to make up at last the national sin; and although, when wilfully determined to break the covenant, he was to be put to death without pity^a; yet for all smaller offences, it was sufficient to mark a loss of privilege, and to point out by what means it could be restored. And also, it was essential that the claim of every individual to the blessings of the covenant should

^a Deut. xiii. 8.

be distinctly shown by some outward and intelligible ceremony.

Under this view, I purpose to consider the subject of sacrifice. I desire to prove that one kind typified, *i. e.* represented, the individual or the national right to the covenanted privileges, and another answered the double end of declaring the sacrificer unworthy of them, and yet restored in consequence of his oblation.

It will not be necessary to enumerate all the different opinions of the nature of sacrifice^a. It will be sufficient if the three principal opinions are mentioned : first, sacrifices are regarded as gifts made to God, in token of the worshiper's piety and gratitude ; secondly, as federal rites, denoting the existence of a covenant between God and the worshiper ; and thirdly, as showing forth, by a lively figure, the great sacrifice on Calvary. All these opinions are severally maintained by writers of distinction ; and yet I have never met with any one, in the whole range of English controversialists, who perceives that the arguments by which he labours to establish his own views, do only apply to one kind of sacrifice, and are totally inapplicable to all others. Who is sufficiently unbiased to understand that some sacrifices were gifts, others were federal rites, and others again of neither kind ?

If it can be shown that on many occasions, if not on most, the offerer brought various forms of sacrifices at the same time, each of which had a different name, and was attended by distinguishing circumstances, I think

^a They will be readily seen in Magee's Notes to the two Discourses on the Atonement, especially notes 48, 49 and 50.

there can be no doubt that each *had* a different purport.

In the seventh chapter of Numbers, there is an account of four kinds of offerings made by the princes of the tribes: first, the *gift* of silver and gold, of flour and incense; secondly, a burnt offering; thirdly, a sin offering; and fourthly, a peace offering. And this account is repeated twelve times, with pretty nearly the same circumstances; and, at any rate, in the same order. Now it surely does not seem reasonable to suppose that these four kinds should all have the same meaning; or, why are they so accurately distinguished the one from the other? And I believe it will be found, on a careful perusal of the Levitical parts of the Old Testament, that after the times of Moses, whenever a *detailed account* is given of a sacrifice, it is always offered in more than one mode. In some instances, as in that just given, all four kinds are specified^a; in most others there are three^b; and in others, only two^c. It is quite evident, that each one kind of sacrifice meant to denote some different state or action of the worshiper. And the four kinds seem to be well distinguished in the above-quoted passage from Numbers vii.

Understanding, therefore, by the word sacrifice, any offering made to God; which is called Corban in the Hebrew; and dividing the Corban into the two heads of *Mincha*, or unbloody, and *Zebach*, or animal sacrifice, as

^a See also Exod. xxix. 1-35. Lev. xxiii. 15-21. Numb. vi. 10-21. 2 Chron. xxix. 20-36.

^b Levit. ix. xiv. 1-32. Ezek. xlii. 13, xliii. 18-27, xliv. 29, xlvi.

^c Exod. xxxii. 6. Lev. xii. Ezra viii. 35. Ezek. xl. 39.

the Jews are wont to do ; the *Zebach* may again be subdivided into three: *Olah*, or whole burnt offering; *Chattah*, or sin offering; and *Zebach shelamim*, or peace offering. This scheme therefore stands thus :—

Corban or Sacrifice.	I. Unbloody Mincha .	1. Sacrificial Gift.
		2. Olah, or Whole Burnt Offering.
	II. Bloody Zebach .	3. Chattah, or Sin Offering.
		4. Zebach Shelamim, or Peace Offering ^a .

^a This is pretty nearly the same division as is usually adopted by Jewish writers. (See Abarbanel, Exord. Comment. in Levit.) There is a great deal of very valuable information in this book of Abarbanel's. The learned Jew, like most of his nation, was quite sensible of a difference existing between the sacrifices, but he wanted Christianity as the connecting link of his broken chain. Instead of this, however, we are offended in the Jewish writings by the most puerile trash; as when Abarbanel very gravely tells us in the Exordium, that three quadrupeds only were offered in sacrifice, because (!) there were three principal Patriarchs; the ox, of course, designating Abraham; because it is the largest of domestic animals, as the father of the faithful was the greatest of the Patriarchs (cap. 1).

The chief error that all Christian writers commit, is the looking upon every one of the sacrifices as indicating the same thing. Thus, Mede (Works, book ii. chap. 7), Cudworth (On the Lord's Supper, chap. 1), and Sykes (Essay on Sacrifice), make *every* offering to be of a federal nature. Outram (De Sacrificiis, i.) and Magee (Discourses on the Atonement) make them all typical of Christ's death.

Cudworth and Outram ought to be read together, that something like a correct view of the subject may be obtained.

Michaelis (Laws of Moses, book iv. art. 187) adopts nearly the same division as that given above, except that he puts drink offerings and meat offerings into two distinct classes, for which there seems to be no sufficient reason.

There is every probability that all unbloody sacrifices were nothing but gifts for the support of religion; because the Hebrew word *Mincha*, which the English version has translated *meat offering* (see Lev. ii. and Numb. vii.), is also used for a present from one man to another (Gen. xxxii. 13, xliii. 11).

I. Under the head of sacrificial gifts is included every thing given expressly for the support of religion ; or as gifts of gratitude to the Author of all blessings ; whether to adorn the tabernacle and temple, or as the presents and tithes to the priests.

It is only a thing to be expected, that men, so soon as they are convinced of their obligation to serve God, should help on his service, by giving of their substance for that purpose.

Cain's offering was most probably of this kind ; and perhaps we ought not to consider that Cain offered one kind of sacrifice, and Abel another, but that they both offered their spontaneous present (*Mincha*) of what they possessed ; and Abel, *in addition*, obeyed a positive command by bringing a holocaust. We find that Abraham gave tithes to the service of God^a ; and that Jacob, when he was poor and had nothing to offer, vowed to give the tenth part of whatever God might bless him with, to the same purpose^b. Both then, and afterwards when he returned rich, he offered up *a sacrificial gift* ; he poured oil on his altar : and the last time he also brought a drink offering^c.

The only difference which the Laws of Moses produced in these gifts, was to make some of them no longer free will offerings, but regularly appointed payments for the service of religion. Up to the date of the Exodus, all *unbloody* sacrifices were probably made, not in obedience to an express law, but as marks of the worshiper's piety, in positions of great good fortune, or as vows during

^a Gen. xiv. 20.

^b Gen. xxviii. 22.

^c Gen. xxviii. 18 and xxxv. 14.

adversity. But when the service of Jehovah was legally enforced, it became necessary to oblige the people to support it. Many of the previously existing sacrificial gifts became now a kind of tax; while others were added, proper to the new phase of religion, and the consecrated ministry of it. The tithes were paid to support the tribe of Levi; and the Lord claimed the first born of beasts and the first fruits of the earth^a.

The meat offerings, consisting, not of flesh (as the modern unlearned English reader might suppose from the translation), but of flour and oil and frankincense; and the drink offerings of wine^b; were most probably of the nature of sacrificial gifts, although they usually *accompanied* other sacrifices, some portion being presented to God, and the greater part being for the food of the priests^c.

Of the same nature were those portions of other sacrifices allotted to the priests, which are called *wave* and *heave* offerings. The distinction between these is so subtle as to escape our observation. But they were evidently sacrificial gifts, which were sometimes merely lifted up, and therefore said to be *heaved*; and, at other times, *waved* to and fro. The names were occasionally applied to the priest's portion of the peace offerings^d; sometimes to an offering of gratitude^e; and in one instance only (I believe) to the blood trespass offering

^a Lev. xxvii. 26-34.

^b Lev. vi. 14-18, xxiii. 13. Numb. xv. 1-7. ^c Lev. vi. 16.

^d Exod. xxix. 24, 27. Lev. vii. 14, viii. 29. Numb. vi. 20.

^e Numb. xv. 19, xviii. 24, 28, &c.

for the leper^a; which was said to be waved, because presented in form to the Lord.

There were, of course, other sacrificial gifts, such as pious men would make from time to time, for the support of the religious ministry; a good example of which occurs in the previously quoted seventh chapter of Numbers.

But it ought to be especially noticed that all these were unbloody; that is, there was no blood required to be shed, in order to make them. For although in some cases, as in the presentation of the wave breast and the heave shoulder, a previous slaughter is necessarily implied; yet it was not the slaughter, but the presentation, which constituted this kind of sacrifice. So also in the gift of whole animals for the support of the priests; the killing of the animal had nothing to do with the offering; because, when an animal unfit for food was brought, it was not killed at all; but money was given instead^b.

These sacrificial gifts were, *in their nature*, such as men are at all times bound to offer, from their own notions of right and wrong. Of course it does not follow that we are required to offer a heave shoulder, or pay tithes, merely because such offerings were made in the service of Israel; but if this kind of offering arose from men's natural religion, and if God confirmed it by enforcing some of them in the Mosaic revelation, it is quite clear that the obligation to make some such offerings is as strong now as ever it was. And so all men regard it. Christian sects differ as to *how* religion is to be supported; but they are agreed that gifts of some kind are to be offered

^a Lev. xiv. 12.

^b Lev. xxvii. 27.

to God's service. A religious man, in making these sacrifices, thinks that his service is acceptable to the Lord; and Christians, in their alms, do not give them so much to the poor, as to their Master, who has declared that in this manner He now will receive gifts. So that, although in a complicated and exact religious system, like the Mosaic, there were many particular modes of paying sacrificial gifts, peculiar to Israel, and which lasted only as long as Israel's religious service did; yet no one can doubt that men, both before the pitching of the Tabernacle, and since the destruction of the Temple, are not freed from this one kind of sacrifice. There is reason in it, apart from any positive command. It belongs properly to natural religion.

But for bloody sacrifices there is no such reason. Who would say that men would make such sacrifices, upon a *natural* conviction that they were pleasing to God? Natural considerations would rather show us that God would be displeased. And moreover, on the supposition that animal sacrifice is as much a part of natural religion as an unbloody offering, "why do we not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pigeon, as a thank offering after any remarkable deliverance, or as an evidence of our apprehensions of the demerit of sin? The true reason is because we cannot know that God will accept such will-worship, and so conclude that we should herein worship God in vain^a." We do not continue animal sacrifices, because there is no reason in the thing itself; and because God's providence has so ordered events, that obedience

^a See Faber's Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice, sect. iii. chap. 4.

to the only positive injunctions he left for the offering of blood, is now simply impossible. If, however, all sacrifice rested upon the same grounds, we should have no more right to discontinue the *Zebach* than the *Mincha*. There could have been no more reason to make Noah's Holocaust a sweet savour to the Lord, than to make animal sacrifices by us also well pleasing. If there were *reason* with the ante-Levitical men, for making such offerings, before any revealed command to that effect; there is exactly the same reason with us, the post-Levitical, who have had no command to the contrary. Some advocates indeed for the human and natural origin of *all* sacrifice, get rid of this difficulty by saying that sacrifice was annulled by the Gospel^a. But the fact is, the Gospel in no passage says a single word about the annulling of any sacrifice. We are quite sure that Jesus never left any command to discontinue sacrifices, because the Jewish Christians continued them for forty years after his death. I do not now mean to say that the *Zebach*, or animal sacrifice, was of any use during that period; but the fact that the Apostles, and even Paul^b, sanctioned such offerings, is proof sufficient, not only that no express command was left for their discontinuance, but that the reason for their ceasing was so impalpable, that most probably if the destruction of the Temple had not taken place, they

^a Beausobre, *Introd.* page 107.

^b In Acts xxi. 18-26. Paul, *suspected* of despising Moses, is counselled by his brother Apostles to show that the suspicion was unfounded, by providing for the Nazarites the offerings requisite for purification. Among these were holocausts and sin offerings (Numb. vi. 14).

would have continued. And thus, if animal sacrifices were originally independent of the Jewish polity, or of the crucifixion, we should really be very deficient in our religious worship without them. But if, as I hope to prove, all animal sacrifices were enjoined for particular purposes, and those purposes ceased at the crucifixion, then the value of them ceased also. And here, as in other like instances, man did not *at first* perceive their termination; because God did not command that they should cease. He had so arranged that they should only be offered in the Temple:—he allowed the offering of them to become impossible, by destroying that Temple.

II. With regard to the animal sacrifices, in which the spilling of blood constituted the sacrifice itself; I am amazed that so many Christian writers have not perceived the very essential difference between the whole burnt offering, and the others; a difference so important, that it affects the whole meaning of the Mosaic Institutes. I shall defer what I have to say on the subject of burnt offerings, till I come to speak of the faith of Israel which was independent of Israel's covenant; and which, I hope to show, was most intimately connected with the Holocausts. In anticipation of what I shall then adduce, let me assume at present, that these Holocausts were well known before Israel became a peculiar people; and that, at all times, there was nothing to prevent non-Israelites from making them. Therefore it will be at once evident that whole burnt offerings were not in any way connected with the Old Covenant; and do not concern our present

argument, which is treating of The *Federal* Institutions^a.

III. But the peace offerings, and sin offerings, were so evidently *Covenant* sacrifices, that not only were they confined to those in the Old Covenant, but they were never heard of before that covenant; and their very *nature* prevented any but Israelites from offering them. And, while I avail myself of the arguments of such men as Mede and Cudworth, to prove that these, the peace and sin offerings, were *federal* sacrifices, I must also beg the reader's attention to the fact that none of these arguments can apply to the whole burnt offerings, as the advocates of the federal nature of *all* sacrifices would have us believe.

On the other hand, while I hope to point out how very wrong such writers as Outram and Magee have been, to apply their arguments for the Christian meaning of the Holocaust to *all* bloody sacrifices^b, I trust that I may not be considered as proving the *merely federal* nature of any but the sin and peace offerings.

^a I hope it will be clearly understood that at present these are assumptions. The proofs will be found in Chap. V.

^b Even Outram, although unquestionably the most satisfactory writer on this subject, in his haste to prove a deeper meaning than a merely Levitical one, in animal sacrifices, has allowed himself to make the completely erroneous statement that peace offerings were in use before the Law of Moses (*De Sacrificiis*, Disc. 1. chap. 10). He appeals to Exod. x. 25 and xviii. 12, as proof of his assertion. But, when we look to those passages, we find that Moses asks Pharaoh for *zebachim ve oloth*, victims and holocausts; and that Jethro took *olah, u zebachim*, a holocaust, and victims. But not a word about peace offerings, according to the word which is constantly used for this sacrifice; not *zebachim* alone, but *zebachim-shelamim*, victims

In contending, as I have done, that men, without a revelation, could never perceive that the spilling of blood would be acceptable to the Supreme Being, and, therefore, in contending against the human origin of animal sacrifice, I would not needlessly bring myself into collision with those who think that the Levitical Institutions were, many of them, older customs now made sacred by Jehovah's adoption of them. Indeed such opinions have, it must be owned, a very great weight of probability on their side. But then, whereas they have no reference to the Holocaust, which was altogether non-Levitical :—so also, if some human institution was taken and applied to the Jewish religion, with Jehovah's authority stamped upon it, this only shows that the institution was now to be used for Jehovah, with a similar meaning to what it had previously borne for other services. If a sacrifice, regarded in the light of a covenant feast, grounded upon the custom of human covenants, appears in the Levitical worship ; this, so far from proving that a covenant feast with Jehovah was of human contrivance, only establishes that some kind of covenant was appointed with Jehovah ; that is, that some *revelation* was made.

There seems to have been a constant custom among men, to hold feasts together, whenever they made any compact or covenant. It is not unlikely that the custom has been founded upon the natural reason of the thing ;

of peace, *i.e.* peace offerings. (See Exod. xxiv. 5, xxxii. 6. Lev. iii. 1, &c.) It is to a fact, which every one may verify with a Hebrew Concordance, that I appeal, when I say that the *zebachim-shelamim* are never mentioned before Exod. xxiv. 5 ; when the Old Covenant had just been established.

inasmuch as something of the same kind may be traced in the national usages of all countries. We know that in the East, where primitive usages are often stereotyped, a bond of friendship is always established between any persons who may have eaten together. There seems to be some doubt whether the slaying of an animal was, in its origin, merely the necessary and natural introduction to the covenant feast, or was designed as a lively representation of God's anger against him who should hereafter break the covenant. But although, in later heathen times, the killing of the animal was professedly with the latter intention only^a; yet it is possible that this may have been only a degeneracy from the ancient usage of slaying *in order* to eat; since, in the book of Genesis, the idea of eating together is evidently made more prominent than the idea of slaying. But whether,

^a We find in Livy the very form of words used in establishing a *fœdus* between two nations, by slaying an animal: "Per quem populum fiat, quominus legibus dictis stetur, ut eum ita Jupiter feriat, quemadmodum a fecialibus porcus feriat." (Lib. ix. cap. 1.)

It must be owned that the two ideas of eating and of killing both seem so necessary, that there is some doubt whether the Hebrew word for covenant (*Berith*) is derived from a root signifying *to cut down*, or from one actually signifying *to eat*. See Buxtorf's and Gesenius's Lexicons. Mede's Works, book ii. chap. 7. Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, chap. 6.

The idea, of striking being necessary to a covenant, has passed into other languages. In Greek there is the common expression *ὄρκια ρέμνειν*. In Latin we have *ictum fœdus erat*; and again, *fœdus ferire* (Livy, lib. i. cap. 32, and lib. ix. cap. 1). Singularly enough, there is the English colloquial phrase, *to strike a bargain*.

On this subject see Mede, book ii. chap. 7. Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, chap. 6. Lowman on the Hebrew Ritual, Part ii. chap. 2.

in more modern times, we view both ideas together, or only one, as forming the essential part of a covenant ; we may suppose that at all ancient covenant feasts, there was an animal slain *for the purpose* of being eaten ; and we make this supposition, because that seems to have been the mode of conducting treaties in patriarchal times.

Abraham's design in setting the seven ewe lambs by themselves, when he made a covenant with Abimelech, is not very clearly expressed. But it had, most probably, a reference to the custom we have been speaking of^a.

When the Lord God himself made a covenant with Abram, we find that the patriarch provided a feast for Him, and arranged on his altar the *divided* victims, between which a flame, the symbol of Divinity, passed, in order to denote that God accepted His portion of the sacred feast, and consequently made the compact sure^b.

When Abraham's servant went to engage Rebekah for his master's son, he refused to eat with Laban and Bethuel, until they had agreed to the business he came to transact^c.

At the covenant made between Isaac and Abimelech, "he made them a feast, and they did eat and drink^d."

There seems to be some allusion to a covenant feast in the meat of which Isaac partook, before he conveyed the inherited blessing to his son^e.

When Laban and Jacob parted, they made a covenant

^a Gen. xxi. 22-32.

^b Gen. xv. 9-18. Compare Jerem. xxxiv. 18, 19.

^c Gen. xxiv. 33-54.

^d Gen. xxvi. 28-31.

^e Gen. xxvii.

together ; and, at the making of the covenant, they builded an altar, and did eat upon the altar^a.

In these cases there was a feast at a covenant, whether between God and man, or between two men : and therefore there is nothing surprising that when *The Old Covenant* was made between Jehovah and Israel, there should also have been established a covenant feast, known by the name of *peace offering* ; at which God was supposed to give the feast, and was therefore the *convivator* ; while the Israelite, who eat with Him, was the *conviva*.

That the peace offering was a federal feast, will be evident from considering the particular circumstances of this sacrifice.

1. It was brought to the entrance of the priest's court, and there killed, by the offerer himself, who was thus represented as offering the sacrifice in person^b.

2. God's portion was offered, not within the sanctuary where the people could not have witnessed, but on the altar of unhewn stone, which stood outside, and which the offerer could see^c.

3. God took for his portion, the blood, the fat, and the inwards ; the two latter were burnt upon the *external* altar ; and the blood was sprinkled upon the same^d.

4. The offerer was himself to eat all the rest, (except the wave-shoulder and the heave-breast, which became the fee of the officiating priest,) and it was all to be consumed within a limited time^e.

^a Gen. xxxi. 44-46.

^b Lev. iii. 8, 13 ; vii. 29, 30.

^c Exod. xx. 24 ; Lev. vi. 12.

^d Lev. iii. 13-16 ; vii. 22-31.

^e Lev. vii. *passim*.

5. No unclean person, or any who had forfeited his Israelitish privileges, could partake of it^a.

6. No person uncircumcised, and not in *The Covenant*, could, under any circumstances whatever, eat of a peace offering; because none such could come to the door of the tabernacle, or to the entrance of the priest's court^b.

These circumstances distinguish the peace offerings from all others; *in no other sacrifices did the worshiper eat a part*. They alone represented the federal feast. But there is one additional circumstance, which also very remarkably separates the peace offerings from either the Holocaust or the offering for sin; viz.—

7. Whenever the peace offering was made along with other sacrifices, it was invariably the last^c. There does not seem to be a single exception to this rule; and the

^a Lev. vii. 19–21.

^b Exod. xii. 48. Compare Ezek. xlv. 7. with Acts xxi. 28.

^c This circumstance is so important, that I shall subjoin those passages where the peace offering is mentioned as being actually made.

At the consecration of the priests (Exod. xxix. 1–32), the order observed was: the sin, the burnt, and the peace offering.

The same order was observed in the description given of the sacrifices made by Aaron for himself and the people (Lev. ix.).

At the feast of Pentecost were offered: first, the gifts; secondly, the burnt offering; thirdly, the sin offering; and lastly, the peace offering (Lev. xxiii. 17–19).

The same at the sacrifices made by the princes of the twelve tribes (Numb. vii.).

The same, with the exception of the gifts, at the purification of the Nazarite (Numb. vi. 14–17).

At the restoration of religion by Hezekiah, the people were not allowed to partake of the peace offering until they were sanctified (2 Chron. xxix.).

In the same way Ezekiel describes the ordinances of the altar as

interpretation of it is manifest : that, whereas the other sacrifices were required to cleanse or consecrate the worshiper, to make him fit for communion with God, the peace offering represented him as actually in communion; and therefore could only be made after the others.

If to these particulars we join the facts, that the peace offering was never heard of until the people had agreed to the Covenant ; and the blood of the peace offering is especially called the blood of the Covenant ; we shall not hesitate to pronounce that the offering up of this one kind of sacrifice typified, or represented, the existence of The Covenant between Jehovah and the worshiper, by the lively and well-known act of *feasting in company*.*

But there is another remark concerning *individual* peace

not allowing the peace offering to be made until everything was purified (Ezek. xliii. 18-27).

These, I believe, are the only places where there is mention of the peace offerings being actually made ; but even when a list of sacrifices is given, the peace offering *always* comes last. See in addition to the above passages, Exod. xx. 24, xxxii. 6 ; Lev. vi. 12, vii. 37 ; Numb. x. 10, &c.

* The Jews, even in our Saviour's time, were accustomed to connect together, the offering of a sacrifice, and the eating of flesh ; as appears from the argument made use of by St. Paul, in order to keep the Corinthians from eating idol-offered meats, because they which eat of the sacrifices are partakers of the altar (1 Cor. x. 18).

The more strict, indeed, considered that it was not lawful to eat flesh at all, unless it were eaten in communion with God. "When the temple was destroyed the second time, the Pharisees were greatly multiplied in Israel, who taught that it was not lawful to eat flesh, nor to drink wine. R. Joshua applied himself to them, and said, My sons, why do you not eat flesh, nor drink any wine ? They say unto him, Shall we eat flesh, that were wont to offer it upon the altar, and that altar is now broken down ? Shall we drink wine, that were wont to pour it upon the altar, which altar is now gone ?" (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Act. xv. 20.)

offerings, which is of the greatest consequence, though not usually insisted on ; and that is, that these peace offerings did not represent the *ordinary* worship of Israel ; because they were never made (at least so far as positive evidence goes) except after a previous loss of Israelitish privilege. This individual peace offering was therefore *extraordinary* ; denoting a restoration of the worshiper to his state in Israel, which, in that particular instance, he happened to have forfeited.

In the religious service which was made at stated seasons, it was the nation collectively that worshiped ; because the Covenant, which the peace offering denoted, was not with any particular individual, but with the nation of which he was a part.

Three times in the year was the *properly Israelitish* worship offered up, by the assembling together of the united people to eat solemnly with Jehovah. On the three occasions of the Passover, the Pentecost, and the Tabernacles, the nation made the peace offerings ; or celebrated the Old Covenant. And so decided was the relation which all these communion feasts had to the national tenure of the land, that they were always accompanied by gifts of the seasonable produce of it ; a kind of fee paid to the Feudal Lord, under whom the possession was held^a.

^a Lev. xxiii. 9-20. Exod. xxiii. 14-19. The bringing of the first-fruits was for the purpose of acknowledging the original freedom of the gift made by God to their ancestors. The offerer confessed, "A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous. And the Lord brought us forth out

There was but one day in the whole year, the tenth day of Tisri, or the fast of expiation, when the whole people publicly and formally mourned their unworthiness; that they were considered out of communion with God. On that day, no peace offering was made. It was a day of affliction. The people were not permitted to rejoice before the Lord, or to eat with Him^a.

Before we leave the peace offerings, it may be useful to set down the distinguishing particulars of the Paschal feast, that its exact similarity to an individual peace offering may be evident; with the single exception, that the one was personal, the other national.

The Paschal lamb (that is, such parts as were burned) was offered on the *external* altar. It was also brought to the door of the tabernacle, and there killed by the offerer himself^b.

The portions which God took were the blood, the fat, and the inwards^c.

The offerer eat all the rest with his friends. There was no part reserved for the priest, as in any personal peace offering, because the priest had a Paschal feast of his own, being one of the worshipers^d.

of Egypt with a mighty hand and he hath brought us into this place, and hath given us this land, even a land that floweth with milk and honey. And now, behold, I have brought the firstfruits of the land, which thou, O Lord, hast given me." Deut. xxvi. 5-10. On this subject see Outram on Sacrifices, Disc. i. chap. 8.

^a Numb. xxix. 7-11. Lev. xxiii. 26-32; and the whole of Lev. chap. xvi.

^b Deut. xvi. 2-6. 2 Chron. xxx. 17.

^c 2 Chron. xxxv. 11-14.

^d Deut. xvi. 7.

No unclean or uncircumcised person could partake of it^a.

IV. We have seen that no unclean person was permitted to partake of a peace offering. And, in anticipation of Chap. III., we must explain that by uncleanness, we mean, in general, something which put the Israelite out of communion with Jehovah, and, for the time, made him forfeit his privileges. Whenever it happened that this uncleanness was removed, or the privileges restored; before the person was readmitted to communion, another sacrifice was appointed, which should represent in an intelligible manner the worshiper excluded from a covenant feast, and at the same time should reinstate him in his privileges. This will be evident, if we consider the distinguishing characteristics of this kind of sacrifice, called *The Sin Offering*, or *Chattah*.

1. The animal was slain in the same place, and by the same person, as in the peace offering; namely at the door of the tabernacle, by the offerer himself^b.

2. The Lord took the same portions as in the peace offerings; the blood, the fat, and the inwards. The latter were burnt as before; some of the blood was poured into the horns of the *external* altar; the rest was poured round it^c.

3. The portion of the sacrifice that *would* have been eaten by the offerer himself in the peace offering, was,

^a Exod. xii. 48. Numb. ix. 6-8. Josh. v. 8-10. See the *Treatise of Maimonides de Sacrificio Paschali*, translated into Latin by L. De Compiegne de Veil. London, 1683.

^b Lev. iv. 22-30.

^c Lev. iv. 25, 26, 34, 35. See Mede and Cudworth as above.

in the sin offering, to be eaten by the officiating priest, not anywhere (as the wave and heave offerings), but with the Lord, in the holy place: none of it was carried away^a.

4. When the sin offering was for the anointed (that is, the high) priest, or for the whole congregation, the part usually eaten, was not, in this case, eaten at all; nor yet offered in sacrifice. It was carried *outside* the camp, and there destroyed^b.

5. In this latter case, the offering of God's portion was made with greater solemnity. Some of the blood was taken within the sanctuary, and sprinkled seven times before the dividing vail, and put into the horns of the *inner* altar^c.

These particulars show clearly enough, that the sin offering for individuals did not differ from the peace offering, except in the very striking respect, of the offerer being exhibited as shut out from the federal feast; and in the solemn placing of some of the blood upon the external altar, by which the reinstatement of privilege was probably signified. There is no hint dropped of any atonement for *moral* guilt; the Israelite was only restored to his Israelitish station.

In the offering for the whole congregation, *i. e.* for the

^a Lev. vi. 26, x. 17. It is quite evident that the sin offering spoken of in the latter passage was not for the whole congregation; because Aaron's fault was in burning instead of eating it: and it was especially enjoined that for the whole congregation it should be burned (Lev. iv. 21). Compare Lev. iv. 16, 17. and Exod. xxx. 10. with Lev. vi. 30. Magee has greatly confused this point, Note 42. p. 287.

^b Exod. xxix. 14. Lev. iv. 11, 12, 21; vi. 30.

^c Exod. xxx. 10. Lev. iv. 6, 7, 16-18.

whole nation ; or for the high priest, who represented the whole nation, being the mediator between Jehovah and Israel ; not only was there nothing eaten, but there was added the solemnity of sprinkling the blood before the vail.

There is also a similar remark to make here to the one before made in respect to the peace offerings ; namely, an individual sin offering was extraordinary, not the usual worship of the people. By which is meant, that its only object to an individual was to restore him to his covenant privileges, when he had forfeited them *for the time* ; and that it is never mentioned as actually offered by an individual, except for recovery from *legal uncleanness*, such as at the consecration of the Priests and Levites, the purification of the Nazarite, or of the woman after child-birth. No instance can be pointed out where a sin offering was made for a sin of the affections, or as the regularly established worship of an individual. The sin offerings which were established, apart from this *extraordinary* service, were made for the entire nation, or its representative, and had regard therefore only to such sins as a nation can commit.

Putting all these circumstances together, we conclude that the offences for which the sin offering made atonement were only legal ; they regarded, that is, only the infraction of the Old-Covenant. Moral offences were never in any case done away by this sacrifice, or were even concerned at all with it. And we build this conclusion upon the evident facts, that it regarded only *Israelites after the flesh* ; that it was never heard of be-

fore the Israelitish covenant was established ; that there is never any mention made of its being actually offered by an individual but for *legal* sins ; and that it only differed from the peace offering in its being eaten by proxy.

Moreover, this conclusion will be placed beyond a doubt, if we consider also that the sin offering (*Chat-tah*) is never directly mentioned but once^a in those parts of the Old Testament which are decidedly non-Levitical, in the Book of Job, in the Psalms, and in the prophecy of Isaiah. Surely this circumstance, even if it stood alone, would strike us as very remarkable, in that the only parts of the Old Testament, which are disconnected from Levitical rites and ceremonies, and which refer therefore to the inward faith of the people, make no mention whatever of the sin offering ; and would induce us to pause before we assented to the all but universal opinion of Christian writers, that the sin offering partially atoned for moral guilt.

It seems probable that a great deal of the misapprehension has arisen from the use of the word *atonement*. We are accustomed to use it only for the reconciliation effected by Christ's death : but the word, both in English and in other languages, signifies any reconciliation^b ;

^a This one exception is at Psalm xl. 6, where the Lord is said *not* to require it. There is the same exclusion of all the *federal* sacrifices from these non-Levitical books : the burnt offering, on the contrary, is often mentioned.

^b *At-one-ment*, a reconciliation, or bringing to unity. *Atone* (to be at one), Johnson. See also Magee on the Atonement, Notes 28, 36.

and when used for the sin offering^a, expresses nothing more than that, in consequence of this sacrifice, there was reconciliation made between God and the worshiper : whereas the worshiper, before the sacrifice, was not in communion, he was now restored. In the Old Covenant, the sin offering made atonement by bringing back the Israelite to his share in *that* covenant. In the New, the offering of Christ also made atonement, by bringing all men to their share of *this* covenant. But to suppose that the two atonements were the same, is not only to confound the two covenants together, but to make the death of Christ of no avail, if it only effected what was effected before.

Magee, in his work on the Atonement, is of opinion that the sin offering was something more than a federal sacrifice, in that the blood was sprinkled before the Lord. He has, however, forgotten a very important circumstance, namely that this was not done for individual sin offerings : only in the sin offering for the high priest, or for the entire nation, this more awful rite was performed. I would not insist on what occurs at first, that this may, after all, have only been the more solemn offering of God's portion (the blood) to Him within his own proper dwelling ; which could not be made for an ordinary sin offering, because the individual Israelite could not witness what was going on within the sanctuary. But, admitting that it implied, not so much the eating together, as the taking of life, and that the reconciliation was effected by the blood, it is very remarkable that

^a See Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35.

this was only the case for the whole nation (or its mediator). From which the palpable deduction is, that it reconciled, not particular individuals, but Israel, to God; it had reference to the Israelitish covenant, which had nothing to do with the sins of the affections. Even in the still more solemn sin offering made on the day of expiation, when all idea of eating together seems removed, and when it ought, perhaps, to be admitted, without scruple, that *then* at any rate the slaughter constituted the sacrifice; yet the mere circumstance that it was said to atone for *all* the sins of the nation, is proof enough that moral offences were not meant; for if so, subsequent punishment, whether by the hand of God or of the magistrate, would have been a positive injustice. What kind of atonement would it have been, if punishment still were impending over any of the sins said to be atoned for?

This atonement was not for any number of individuals, but for the nation, in its national capacity; and the sins were therefore only such as a nation could commit; in no case sins of the affections. The truth is apparent, from our previous conclusions respecting the Old Covenant, that the atonement made on the tenth day of Tisri had reference only to that covenant; it denoted, by a very plain figure, the nation not *worthy* to be in covenant with God, and at the same time restored, because of the atonement therein made.

To confuse the sin offering with the burnt offering, as Magee has done, is not only to injure, but to destroy, the value of his book; because, as I have before hinted, the

moral atonement by the sin offering would be so far from proving the atonement by Christ, that this latter would have been quite needless. Nothing more would have been now done than the blood of bulls and of goats could do quite as well.

The difficulty also is by no means got rid of, by saying (as the Jews do) that the atonement was inefficacious, unless accompanied by repentance. To Jews and to Christians alike it might be sufficient to reply, that repentance in no one place of Scripture is mentioned as a requisite for the efficacy of the sin offering. In the yearly sin offering, wherein alone there seems to be a departure from the idea of a federal feast, nothing is said about a penitent being reconciled, and an impenitent being left without reconciliation; but that the atonement was for *all* the sins of *all* the people^a. But let me again ask Christians, who believe that Christ was the propitiation for our moral sins, how can they, on their own principles, find fault with the Jews for not receiving this atonement, if they already had one of as much virtue^b?

^a Lev. xvi. 30–34.

^b Let me here remark, that this objection does not apply to the burnt offerings. For this simple reason: *they are never said to make atonement*, except indeed in one instance (Lev. i. 4); which is however so plain an exception to the general rule, that it is usual to take the phrase as rather expressive of a wish for reconciliation, than an actual atonement (see Patrick's note on the passage). At any rate, no one denies that the office of the burnt offering in general was not to make atonement; and it is never called a propitiatory sacrifice (see Tholuck's Dissertation on the Institution of Sacrifice). Few would be disposed to put the Holocausts below the sin offerings; and yet, if the latter made atonement for moral offences, how strange that the former could not!

It is unreasonable enough to refer to the Book of Leviticus, where moral guilt is not mentioned, for proof of the all but universal dogma that the sin offerings were a kind of atonement by instalments ; as though the value of one sin offering just lasted out through the year, and then, like a lease, required renewal. But I am utterly at a loss to comprehend how so many orthodox English commentators can appeal to the tenth chapter of the Hebrews as proving that the yearly offering gave an imperfect, or partial, or terminable remission for moral guilt. I cannot conceive how any one can gather from the ninth and tenth chapters anything else than this, that those sacrifices were so much inferior to the Great Sacrifice, in that they sanctified to the purifying of the flesh ; but that Christ's death purged the conscience^a. It is especially declared that the Law, in its sacrifices, had only a sha-

^a The extraordinary impression upon the minds of commentators, that the sin offering was for moral offences, has induced some of them to thrust upon the inspired author of the Hebrews, expressions that destroy the whole force of his argument. Let the reader look at Whitby's unauthorized filling-up of what he supposes gaps in the beginning of the tenth chapter, and wonder, with me, how he could have ventured to bring in that unfortunate word "for ever," where the apostle evidently had excluded it. The writer of the Epistle says : "It is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sin." Dr. Whitby says : "It was quite possible to do so for one year, but not for ever."

Dr. Whitby is not alone ; all the usually read commentaries follow the same course. I have selected his name only because he is of great authority. It will be found that all the commentators, perused by the unlearned, follow the same fatal error. I call it fatal, because it is one of the props of the so-called covenant of works, upon which a great deal of the worst theology is made to rest. Of course there are divines who take the true view of the matter ; but their opinions

dow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things^a; which plainly means, that the yearly sacrifice was only suggestive of those future good things; that is, of remission of moral guilt;—it could not do what Christ's sacrifice did. But commentators, on the contrary, suppose that the yearly sacrifice was a portion of the good things to come, that it partly purged the conscience from dead works, that the blood of bulls and of goats took away an annual instalment of moral sins.

It need scarcely be insisted on, that in all these passages the author of the Epistle is speaking of the sin offerings made on the tenth day of Tisri; for he only mentions bulls and goats, which alone were the animals then slain. Singularly enough, he does not allude to the burnt offerings at all (except indeed in a quotation from the 40th Psalm)^b. The whole of the argument turns

have never been allowed to influence a great deal of the popular theology.

Michaelis very happily calls the sin offerings a kind of ecclesiastical penance (*Laws of Moses*, Book v. art. 244).

Lowman says, "Men were not to be encouraged to believe or hope that the blood of bulls or of goats could take away the guilt of sin committed against moral laws, or remove the punishment due to moral crimes. The ritual served only to purge ritual defilements, and expiate ritual transgressions." (*Ritual*, Part iii. chap. 1.)

Sykes, heterodox though he sometimes was, has some very valuable remarks on this subject in his *Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion*, chap. 12. pp. 185 & 189. Milman's *History of the Jews* will be found to be less incorrect than any popular work.

^a Heb. x. 1.

^b See Heb. x. 8. It may be observed, that there is indeed one apparent exception to this assertion that, in the Epistle, the burnt offerings are not disadvantageously compared with the offering of Christ, as the sin offering is;—at Heb. vii. 27, the apostle would

upon the inferiority of the legal atonement, which took away only legal offences ; to the moral atonement, which alone expiated moral guilt. Of course, if this is true, it would follow, *à fortiori*, that no other federal sacrifice could be more effective. The burnt offerings, not being federal sacrifices, did not belong to the argument at all.

The proof from Scripture being insufficient, the advocates of the moral expiation of the sin offering bring in the authority of the Rabbis, to decide a point whereon they and Christians are at issue. The Jew, believing in the eternal sanctions of the Mosaic law, and being in error, precisely because he has confounded moral and ritual transgressions together, will of course be led to insist upon the atonement effected in the Temple ; since it is absolutely essential that he must oppose the fact

seem to speak of the *daily burnt offering* ; but the expression “offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people,” confines it to the sin offering on the fast of expiation, when only this successive sacrifice took place. The word *daily*, κατ’ ἡμέραν, is not to be taken literally, but means only *continually*, διαπαντός (see Tholuck on the passage).

Faber has very much confused this point (*Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice*, sect. 4. chap. 5).

I make but little account of the argument for the moral atonement of the sin offering, on the supposition that Cain is said to have been recommended to offer a *chattah*, so much insisted on by both Magee (*The Atonement*, note 65), and after him by Faber (*Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice*, sect. 4. chap. 3) ; because, not only is it very doubtful whether the word *chattah* does in this place mean an offering, since it is constantly used for *sin* alone ; but even if it be certain that a sacrifice is meant, it is quite clear, in spite of the name, that it could not be the same offering, either in form or design, as the *chattah* of Israel. Admitting therefore all they advance, yet nothing would thence follow to establish the moral efficacy of the Levitical sin offering.

adduced by the Christian Jew who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, that an atonement for moral guilt was *wanting*. Abarbanel speaks indeed of the burnt offering (chiefly, if not only) being slain instead of the offerer^a. But what a singular line of argument to quote these Jewish opinions, which were evidently brought forward in contradiction to the Christian's belief that the blood of bulls and of goats could *not* take away sin !

Maimonides, the acute Rabbi, who, in his rationale of Judaism, has intended to write covertly against the Nazarenes, perceived at once the force of the Christian retort, that if the Jewish sacrifices took away moral guilt, there is nothing that holds their place now, when God's providence has rendered the offering of those sacrifices absolutely impossible. His own theory is, that the sacrifices were only efficacious when accompanied by repentance ; and that now, when there is no sanctuary, and no altar, repentance *alone* is the only expiation^b. He contends, that he who repents is as though he had never sinned ; and that his own nation shall at length be restored by their repentance only^c.

Understanding, therefore, what the intention of Maimonides was, namely to declare that no substitution of a victim could do away with sin, except in so much as it *represented* the penitence of the worshiper, we shall not be surprised that he labours so ingeniously to prove that *all* the sacrifices had no really vicarious nature. At one

^a Exord. Comment. in Levit. cap. 4.

^b Canones de Pœnitentiâ, cap. i.

^c Ibid. cap. 7.

place he endeavours to establish his point by showing that in general the greater the sin was, the viler the victim; therefore, he argues, the victim did not remove the sin^a. To this purpose also he says, that the great sin offering of a bull for the priest, and a goat for the congregation, represented the sin of Aaron, who sinned by a calf (when he made the molten image), and the sin of the fathers of the congregation, by a goat (when they dipped Joseph's coat in a kid's blood); the design of these offerings being, not to clear guilt, but to *prevent* the priest or the congregation from *imitating* their fathers' sins. "When therefore these things were once deeply fixed in the breast, they would undoubtedly cause the man *to take heed to his sins*, lest he should offend God, and so would have need of a long, daily, and painful expiation, which perhaps *in the whole duration of his life* he would never accomplish; and consequently the man will strive to flee from and shun the beginning and causes of sin^b."

He probably intends, in this passage, that unless the man, by considering the *penance* which Aaron and the congregation were obliged to perform, avoided the like sins, he might also have a similar penance to undergo, long and troublesome as theirs.

Further on, as the very climax of his argument, that no sacrifices could properly do away with sin, he refers to the scape-goat, which, although said to make expiation for the greatest sins, was yet not sacrificed at all, but only sent away: "For no one doubts that sins cannot

^a Moreh Nevochim, Pars iii. cap. 46. p. 486. ^b Ibid. p. 487.

at all be such burdens as to be capable of being transferred from the shoulders of any one man to those of another. But those actions (connected with the scape-goat) were all figurative, in order to strike terror into men's minds, and by this means to bring about their conversion. (We are taught by this figure) that we are free from all our transgressions, we have cast them behind our back, and sent them away to the extremity of the earth^a."

Now these arguments of the learned Jew are erroneous, for the simple reason before stated :—the Books of Moses do not say one word about repentance being required for the validity of a sacrifice. But what shall we say to those authors who quote Maimonides as coinciding with them, that the victim in the sacrifices was intended to suffer the punishment due to the worshiper, or that the sacrifice could do away with moral sin? when the whole force of his arguments (anti-christian as they are) goes to establish the doctrine that the sinner's amended life was then, as now, the only true expiation^b.

^a Moreh Nevochim, Pars iii. cap. 46. p. 489.

^b Magee on the Atonement, Note 33. Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. vii.

The fault of Magee, who professes to quote Maimonides, is inexcusable. He may perhaps have been misled by the Jew's use of the ambiguous word *vicarious*. It is quite evident from the above passages that he did not mean that the sacrifices were vicarious by the victim's death doing away with the sin, but by their bringing forcibly before the offender's mind that unless he repented he should also suffer pain.

Magee seems to have been quite aware of this lower sense of the word *vicarious*; but he does not detect any but the higher sense in Maimonides.

If, then, I have succeeded in convincing the reader that the sin and peace offerings were unconnected with moral offences, it will follow, from what we have seen in the course of this chapter, that whenever an individual Israelite lost his privileges, and could be restored to them, the restoration was signified by the sin offering; and that by the great sin offering on the day of atonement, was declared the general unworthiness of Israel to be in covenant with Jehovah.

Before the sin offering was made, the Israelite of course had no share in the Covenant; he was as though he had not been circumcised. The expression made use of to signify this state of excommunication, is the being *cut off from the people, or from the congregation, or from Israel*; the same for an uncircumcised person as for him who transgressed such ritual commandments as eating leavened bread during the passover, or compounding an oil like the sacred oil^a, &c.

In some of these cases, as, for instance, when the king Uzziah, a perpetual leper, was cut off from the house of the Lord^b, it is clear that nothing else is meant than that he was out of communion with Israel. In other cases, where there was a *wilful* disobedience, *additional* punishment was threatened. For all sins of ignorance, and perhaps for minor *ritual* offences of the will, the sin offering made atonement: but for all sins of presumption, sins with a high hand, no atonement by the sin offering could be made; these offences remained un-

^a See Gen. xvii. 14. Exod. xii. 15, 19; xxx. 33, 38, &c.

^b Compare 2 Chron. xxvi. 21 with Lev. xiii. 46.

atoned for ; or, in the language of the Lawgiver, “ such a person shall be utterly cut off ; his iniquity shall be upon him^a ;” his iniquity is not expiated ; it is still obnoxious to punishment.

In some instances this impending punishment was executed by the magistrate, if the offence were of a nature to be cognizable at the civil tribunal ;—as the sabbath-breaker was not only *cut off*, but he was also to be executed ; that is, for such an offence not only was there no atonement made by the sin offering, but *besides*, the offender was to be put to death^b.

^a Numb. xv. 30, 31.

^b Compare Exod. xxxi. 14, 15, with Numb. xv. 32–36. On the meaning of the expression “ cut off,” see Patrick’s Note on Gen. xvii. 14. Wells on Exod. xii. 19. See also Michaelis’ *Laws of Moses* ; and Warburton, *Div. Leg.*

I shall hereafter have to recur to this peculiar expression, in the proof of the implication of a future life in the Books of Moses, when I shall show how impossible it is to give any other meaning to it.

POSTSCRIPT.

As my object, in the foregoing chapter, is not an explanation of all the Levitical Ritual, but only of those sacrifices which refer to the Israelitish Covenant, I have refrained from entering on any subjects foreign to our purpose, because I wish not only to preserve the unity of the book, but also to avoid the proposing of theories which must rest mainly on conjecture.

I have not, therefore, said anything about the trespass offering, because it does not seem possible to decide on the distinction between it and the ordinary sin offering. Some understand that the trespass offering was for lesser, the sin offering for greater, transgressions. Others conceive that the sin offering was for

sins of ignorance, which are *afterwards* discovered; the trespass offering for those where there is a doubt whether any offence at all has been committed. Joseph Mede (Book i. Discourse 49) shrewdly conjectures that they were both for *external* offences (as distinguished from sins of the affections); but that the sin offering had reference to the first table, the trespass offering to the second: (see also Abarbanelis Exord. Comment. in Leviticum, cap. 4; and Outram de Sacrificiis, Disc. i. chap. 13). There is very little ground however for any of these opinions. Indeed, from the circumstance of both kinds being sometimes offered together (Lev. xiv. 12, 19; Numb. vi. 11, 12), it is certain that they were not always for different offences, but for the same, regarded in two different lights. All that we can determine with any degree of assurance is, that the sin offering was the generic term for all sacrifices made for external, ritual offences; but that for some legal sins the offering required a slight variation, and was then called a trespass offering.

I have also omitted any account of the two birds killed for the cleansing of leprosy (Lev. xiv. 4-7); the heifer slain for the expiation of an uncertain murder (Deut. xxi. 1-9); and the red heifer, which was burnt without the camp, and whose ashes were mixed with the water of separation (Numb. xix.). For these ceremonies do not seem to have been considered as sacrifices at all: they are not called *Corbanim* in the Scriptures; and, at any rate, they were not made in the tabernacle of Israel, and were therefore not *federal* rites.

The striking account of the mode of dealing with the second goat in the sin offering for the people (Lev. xvi.) has been ingeniously, but I must think erroneously, made to mean a sending of the goat into the wilderness to the evil dæmon Azazel. This notion seems to have been the production of Origen's fertile imagination. Dr. Spencer revived it; and Hengstenberg has given his great name in support of the fancy.

The reasons given for this interpretation are:

(1.) The strict antithesis of the sentence; one lot to Jehovah, and the other to Azazel. Therefore, it is argued, the second goat stood in exactly the same relation to Azazel, as the first did to Jehovah.

(2.) To understand what Azazel means, which nowhere else occurs in the Bible, we must have recourse to the cognate languages, where a similar word signifies Satan.

(3.) The word Azazel cannot, it is said, signify ὁ χίμαρος ἀποπομπαῖος, 'scape-goat,' or 'goat allowed to escape;' because the Hebrew word *äz* means a she-goat; and in this place, a he-goat is especially mentioned.

(4.) There is some similarity supposed to exist between this offering and the Egyptian propitiation of Typhon: (see Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, on Azazel; *Christology*, chap. 2; and *Commentary on the Psalms*, Appendix 7).

This fourth ground is mere conjecture, and, by itself, of no value; if it proves anything at all, it proves more than Hengstenberg intends; for, although he is careful to say that no propitiation of Satan can be meant,—as indeed the whole spirit of the Pentateuch, and especially an express law, immediately following this account (Lev. xvii. 7), are palpably opposed to such a notion,—yet, if such an offering were not intended, where is the connection between it and the sacrifice to Typhon?

I am not sufficient Hebraist to determine the third ground, from the gender of the word; yet the learned German has forgotten that this very word *äz* is used elsewhere for the goat of the sin offering (Numb. xv. 27), and why should it not therefore be used here also for a goat? Indeed the expression, The He-goats of the *izzim* (pl. of *äz*) (Lev. xvi. 5; Ezra vi. 17), would seem to make this word not solely feminine, but a noun of species, including both males and females. It is somewhat remarkable that this word, although feminine, is one of those inflected in the plural, and with the postfixes, as if they were masculine.

That a word like *Azazel*, afterwards, in the other Semitic languages, should denote Satan, is nothing remarkable, since the etymology of the word (*semotus*, *abscissus*) would apply equally well to the scape-goat and to the Spirit of Evil. We ought not to wonder that because the *goat* was rejected, its name should be so similar to a subsequent name of Satan, derived from the same root; but it would by no means follow that the Azazel in the one case would be the Azazel in the other. And indeed, as most persons do not fail to remark, there is nothing in the con-

text to lead to the meaning of Satan—everything to lead to that of goat. If Azazel means the Devil, the passage is singular; nothing else is like it in the whole of the Books of Moses; which not only expressly discountenance dæmon-worship, but seem to have been purposely reserved on the existence of any evil spirit at all.

The strongest ground is that derived from the antithetical structure of the sentence. But, not to insist upon the unfairness of pressing grammatical strictness, in opposition to the evident design of the writer,—particularly in the Hebrew, where one preposition has to do the duty of a dozen in the Greek,—yet, if this strict antithesis is to be maintained, we must read, *one lot to be offered in sacrifice to Jehovah, and the other to be offered in sacrifice to Azazel*; an interpretation from which Hengstenberg would shrink. For not only would it be adverse to the Mosaic Law; but the fact is, this second goat was not sacrificed at all;—it was let loose, an action the very reverse of all we understand about sacrifices. And if we read, as Hengstenberg would propose, *one lot to be offered in sacrifice to Jehovah, and the other to be sent to the Devil*, all argument from strict antithesis is at end. The interpretation adopted by the Septuagint, and most versions, *one lot to be the goat that is to be offered to Jehovah, the other to be the goat that is to be called Azazel*, is quite as antithetical.

On the whole, in spite of Hengstenberg's great authority, there is not sufficient reason to depart from the usual sense. The *Azazel* was a technical word, only applied to that goat, which, after the sin offering was made, was figuratively laden with sins, and sent into the wilderness, to represent, not that this second goat made any atonement, but that those sins were removed for which atonement had already been made.

The Azazel, regarded in this light, was not properly a part of the sin offering, but an adjunct to it, of a very similar nature to the birds let loose on the cleansing of a leper.

Some of these remarks, and much valuable information will be seen in Tholuck's Discourse on the Institution of Sacrifice, appended to his Commentary on the Hebrews.

CHAPTER III.

HOLINESS.

THE truths we have hitherto been considering, show that the Mosaic institutions, by themselves, without regard either to what had gone before or what they were to introduce, had reference only to the one nation of Israel, and had nothing whatever to do with a spiritual faith, or with a future life, except *in the way of suggestion*.

The dislike, on the part of many pious people, to look upon the religion of Israel and the whole Levitical service as merely temporal, contrasts strangely with the assertion in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Old Covenant was ready to vanish away, and was never intended to be anything but an introduction to something better. It was, as has been happily said, the shell, inside which a very valuable kernel lay hidden; but as its only design was to preserve the kernel until this was ripe for use, so, when once broken, and the fruit discovered, it was valueless.

The great Apostle of the Gentiles, in dissuading his converts from looking to the Levitical Law for a spiritual religion, expresses the same truth, when he says that "Before faith (*i. e.* Christianity) came, we were kept under the Law (the Levitical Law) *shut up unto the faith* which should afterwards be revealed:" and he compares this Law to the *pædagog* (*i. e.* the slave who took the

children to school) who was to bring us to Christ. By which he evidently means that as this *pædagogus* did not teach, but conducted to the teacher; so the Law of Moses could not impart spiritual religion, but introduced the world to it^a.

Whoever wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses the same idea by another metaphor, where the old institutions are compared to the milk given to infants, who are not fit for the strong meat of Christianity. As the infant cannot be nourished by strong meat, so the people of the old world were not yet fitted for the Gospel. But, when the child has been prepared, by the milk, for the meat of full age, it would be improper to feed him any longer upon milk: so also, when man has been fitted, by the preparatory religion of Moses, for the only religion of those of full age, the preparation was of no further use; indeed would do harm^b.

^a Gal. iii. 23 & 24.

^b Heb. v. 12-14. See also 1 Cor. xiii. 11. The great Rabbi Maimonides has the same metaphor, when speaking of the fact that a spiritual religion was not palpable (at any rate) in the Law. He compares the mere words of the Law to the food given to sucklings: "For because, when they are born, they are very tender and cannot be nourished with solid food, God has so adapted the mothers' breasts for producing milk for them, that they may be nourished with fluid food of a kind suitable to the condition of their organs, until they are duly and gradually dried up and strengthened." (*Moreh Nevochim*, Pars iii. c. 32.) The Jew means us to understand that the wise Cabalist could detect the spiritual meaning couched under the carnal words; whereby he damages the whole force of the figure. Instead of seeing that the Levitical ordinances *prepared* for something stronger and better, he claims for the gifted Rabbi the power of conjuring the milk into solid meat. For other metaphors of the same kind, see Grotius de Veritate, v. 6; Lowman on the Hebrew Ritual, Part i. chap. 3.

Now it is a very common error to make the milk for babes part of the strong meat for men. To suppose that God ever proposed a covenant of works, whereby salvation could be patched up, is the same as to suppose a futile endeavour to feed strong men upon milk, or to elevate the nursery slave to the duties of a professor.

But, leaving metaphors, and in reply to the question, Wherefore then serveth the Levitical Law, if it could not bring salvation?—let us give the answer of the Apostle, “It was added because of transgressions^a;” that is, before the Gospel could be received, it was necessary that those inherent tendencies of mankind should be destroyed, which would otherwise have prevented the acceptance of it. The Law of Moses prepared the world for Christianity in several ways:—

1. It bore a stern and uncompromising testimony to the unity of Jehovah, which the world was forgetting. Nor can we have any doubt that the Old Covenant has established this truth upon an imperishable foundation among all who are indebted to Israel for the commencement of their religion, whether Jews, Christians, or Mahometans; since among all these, whatever danger there may be of atheism, there is none of polytheism. And this safety is remarkable, because we know that among all people whose faith has not sprung from Israel, the unity of God is either entirely lost, or so obscured as to have no practical consequences in the worship of men.

^a Gal. iii. 19. The reader will not fail to observe, that the Apostle insists that the Law was not against the promises of God, although it could not give life. These two features ought to be reconciled.

This polytheism has arisen from the gradual elevation of the spiritual ministers, the lesser gods, into the rank, or at any rate to the functions, of the Great First Cause. All Paganism may be traced, not to a positive denial of Jehovah, but to a withdrawal of worship from Him to beings more nearly resembling mankind. And yet it may be easily discovered, that wherever the Books of Moses have produced any effect, even though there be the same indications of a wish towards the lesser gods, it has never produced polytheism. The adoration of angels by some of the earlier heretics disappeared by being merely placed in contrast with the truth. The same error in other times or places led of a certainty to all the false gods of the nations. The advance of civilization alone has, with us, dissipated the popular opinion of fairies, although the ancient mythology rested upon no broader foundations. Even in our own days, the propensity to hero-worship, evidenced by the turning of men into saints, and receiving their dogmas as absolute, would once have originated a host of Jupiters and Vishnus, but now it is comparatively a harmless error; it causes men to put human folly into the position of Divine wisdom; but we never fear that it will rise up to battle down Jehovah.

And this safety we owe to the peculiar œconomy of Judaism, in making God's unity the foundation of the whole system; in not threatening *future* punishments to the polytheist, which experience has proved to be inoperative; but in exhibiting before men's eyes that Israel was actually punished when Jehovah was forgotten. No

man who believes in the mere history of the Jews, can have the smallest shadow of a doubt that Jehovah is One, without equal or rival.

Nay, so necessary it seems to be that Christianity cannot exist where this notion is in danger of being lost, or even weakened, that when the subtle distinctions of quibbling theologians threw doubts upon God's absolute oneness, the fanatical Moslem was suffered even to extinguish the truth, when that truth was fast gliding into an infinitely worse error than a bloody propagation of falsehood, or a denial of Christ's divinity. It was less dangerous that the prophet of Islam, if he made no mistake about God's unity, should destroy a corrupt Christianity, than that the disciples of the true prophet should teach men to speak of an inequality in the Divine nature, or a separation of God into two.

2. But this is not all:—A belief, a mere notion, of God's unity, by itself, would have been of little value. The heathen philosophers held that belief. And even in the most extravagant Paganism the shadow of such a notion may be traced, dim indeed, and without efficacy, because it never influenced men's lives; but still such as to show that a bare assent of the understanding to the unrivaled nature of the Great First Cause could not *alone* fit men for the Gospel. The glad tidings have never been listened to, but where there has existed a previous conviction that sin must inevitably produce misery. When therefore, in the Old Covenant, Jehovah is depicted, not as the distant First Cause of the schools, nor as the passive Fates of the popular mythology, but as

one exerting an immediate and sensible providence over human affairs, a strong conviction is produced that the punishment of sin is an absolute and necessary part of God's government.

Had He merely threatened *future* punishments, which men in this life did not witness, and therefore might question, this conviction would not have been produced. But when He made a temporal covenant with Israel, and was found to be extreme to mark what was done amiss, by always visiting a violation of the laws of that covenant with unmistakeable punishment, men began to perceive the great probability,—the certainty,—that all sin should some time or other meet with a properly ordained death. In this aspect the Old Temporal Covenant was a fit *pædagogus* to the Gospel.

3. But even a more valuable assurance still is conveyed to us in the fact that God has *once* revealed Himself to mankind. This is a very great debt which the world owes to Israel. For not only is it certain that no religious system has reached this point, except those based upon God's revelation to the holy people; but even among scorners, who have nothing to set up in opposition, if they believed in one exhibition of God, the whole prejudice against the Christian revelation would be removed. And therefore, if the real want in their case be (as it undoubtedly is) an assurance that God might be expected to reveal Himself at all, then the whole value of the immediate and temporal interference of Jehovah in the affairs of Israel is apparent, in that it would be sufficient with any one who received Judaism

to give an antecedent presumption that any other manifestation was credible.

And it ought not to be forgotten, that the whole heathen world has just stopped short of this assurance : it was and is the very thing they have been feeling after. The key to the false and flagrant religions of Asia or of Greece, is the frantic effort of unassisted man to get to God, or to invent fables of God coming to man. The second-birth Brahmin, and the wise man of Greece, only for the lack of some well-attested revelation, lost themselves in dreamy speculations and endless genealogies. They wondered and mysticised with no result and no fact. They wanted the simple and sufficient assurance that God himself, the Great First Cause, the Almighty Jehovah, whom the Indian venerated as Passive Intelligence, or the Greek feared as Inexorable Fate, had made Himself known to mankind, and assumed over them a sovereignty and a providence.

Now the three religions that have sprung out of Israel, whether modern Judaism, or Christianity, or Islamism, suppose themselves in perfect possession of this assurance. The Jew regards his own nation as the sole depositary of God's revelations ; he has no need to speculate how he is to find out God ; he points to his Scriptures, where God is proved to have found out men. The Mahometan looks upon God's revelation as so certain, that no terms are to be kept with those who doubt it. With him, religion is not to be confined to devotees and priests, but is to be thrust upon every one, though with the sword. The Christian bases his whole system upon the fact that God

is not to be dreamed of, but is to be seen ; not seen by fanciful philosophers, or privileged castes, but by every human being who will use the intelligence and moral principle with which he is endowed. And if all this is due to Israel, let us not wonder that Israel's divine œconomy was constructed so as to convince men by temporal dealings that God both could and would show Himself.

4. But perhaps the chief cause of all religious falsehood was the material tendency of mankind. Created, as they were, with a very immediate interest in objects of sense, they would, unless some counteracting principle were at hand, fall off into sensuality. We know that this is not only the case among men of no religion, but even the gods that men have made for themselves have usually been personifications of human appetites. Whatever pretences may be made by philosophising Pagans for esoteric spirituality, their published or worshiped representation of Deity has ever been that of a super-eminent man with enlarged means of gratifying his lusts. And the causal connection between man's materialising tendency, and the fabrication of sensual gods, was mutual. This tendency invented the vicious Molochs and Jupiters ; and if men worshiped such impure beings, there was no wonder that they became themselves more tainted. If they changed the glory of the incorruptible God and His truth into a lie, it was but the judicial penalty that God gave them up to uncleanness and vile affections^a.

When therefore God designed to raise men out of this

^a Rom. i. 21-32.

condition, it was absolutely essential that they should be taught to look for guidance, not to a corrupted being like themselves, but to a holy, just, and powerful Spirit.

But there were two obstacles in the way of their attaining anything like adequate conceptions of God's awful and infinite holiness :—

1st. Men had no spiritual language in which to express spiritual ideas. And no stronger proof of this can be mentioned, than that in all languages of ancient date, every word seems primitively to have had a physical meaning. We need not concern ourselves with the question whether the transition of words from a material to a metaphysical sense was owing to the growth of the intellect, or to a religious revelation. But no one disputes the fact, that such a transition must have taken place ; and philologists are so sure of this, that they seek for physical roots to the words of all original languages. This striking fact, indicative of the natural materialism of humanity, puts beyond all controversy that spiritual ideas were not once the property of men. We shall see therefore that the Levitical revelation was adapted to this state of things ; that it taught a spiritual religion by the means of material symbols ; and that, upon the basis of physical cleanliness, it induced men to reflect upon a holiness impalpable by the senses.

2ndly. The other obstacle was the finite intellect of man, which could not grasp what was boundless, nor appreciate what was perfect. We shall therefore find a gradual ascent from the impure creature through an ascending series of holiness ; so that the mind, being thus led to

look from itself, and mounting heavenward up the scale whose lower end touched the earth, might bow before the awful holiness of Jehovah, still higher than the highest range of human vision.

Now with respect to the spiritual holiness symbolised by the material cleanness of Judaism, it may be remarked in general, that this is according to the analogy of types, which run throughout the old temporal religion. We may not regard a type as a Cabbalistic form, in which the initiated might see a deeper spiritual sense*. We may not, with the Rabbis, understand that the land of Israel does not mean the land of Israel; or that instead of bodily cleanness, we are to read spiritual holiness. For

* Few popular commentaries will be found to be free from the Cabbalism of such books as the *Epistle of Barnabas*, who tells us that the 318 servants of Abraham meant something a great deal more mysterious than a plain reader would conceive. In Greek (which the author of the *Book of Genesis* was forsooth well acquainted with) I H are 18, and the beginning of the name Jesus; while the T, that is 300, is of course the cross. Hence, under the very innocent-looking number 318 was secreted the whole mystery of the Gospel (*Barn. Epist. chap. ix.*). For some Jewish fancies, not much more flagrant than many Christian perversions, the reader is referred to *Moreh Nevochim*, Pars iii. c. 32, 33; *Abarbanelis Exord. cap. i.*; *Allen's Modern Judaism*, chap. vii.

Biblical expositors are, it is hoped, getting rid of this fanciful mode of interpreting types. There is a passage in *Tholuck's Dissertation on the Hermeneutics of the Apostle Paul*, which suggests some valuable reflections:—"We are accustomed, in the department of nature, to behold the lower stages, in its most perfect species, as preformants of the higher, and so far prophecies of them. To themselves it is unknown whither they point: but is there not a Spirit who comprehends all the stages as he permits them to arise, and leads them forth in succession? This Spirit knew what he designed, while he was still working and arranging in the lower regions."

although many popular interpretations of the Old Testament are founded upon the Rabbinical mysticism, and although the Epistle to the Hebrews is oftentimes made to speak the dotings of the Mischna, yet a more accurate understanding of types shows them to be *really* shadows, not substances; introductory to religion, but not religion; and the apostolical types in the Epistle to the Hebrews are clearly such as would prepare the world for Christianity, but by no means (that is the sum of the argument) could be Christianity. While therefore we understand types in this way, as being the substratum only of spiritual religion, not spiritual religion under a mask, we shall be in no danger if we amplify what the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us; as we shall not be trusting to the imagination, "that forward delusive faculty, ever obtruding beyond its sphere,—of some assistance indeed to apprehension, but the author of all error," but shall be learning the lesson which God has written for our instruction.

There are many animals naturally unclean, and which we would scarcely ever take for food. And upon this idea, with which men were familiar, much of the typical holiness was raised. It is not pretended that all the animals pronounced to be legally unclean, were such as human delicacy would necessarily reject, but that men, being accustomed to a distinction of that nature, would understand any similar system of separation. The passage from an animal unfit, to one that was fit, for food, was therefore the first step in the upward progress to absolute purity. Again, out of those which were clean

enough for human eating, some were selected as still cleaner, and proper for Jehovah's table. Even of these, it was only such as were free from blemish that were to be offered. And this gradation of course induced a habit of thought that God was purer than men.

With the same design the Lawgiver took advantage of our naturally conceiving of pollution as pertaining to certain states of beings who otherwise would be considered clean. We shrink from contact with a corpse, or with one affected with a loathsome disease; and thus the uncleanness of the dead or the leper was another basis upon which the idea of holiness could be raised. Men readily apprehending the uncleanness of a corpse, or of rotting flesh, it was not a difficult step to make them agree to the uncleanness of one mourning for the dead, or of one who touched that rottenness. And the same principle can be traced through all the legal distinctions between clean and unclean. Many of these distinctions were unquestionably artificial, but they were grafted upon something very similar, which human experience would discover for itself; and they tended to impress upon the mind that there *was* a difference between holy and unholy.

Still more remarkably was the truth of the Creator's superlative holiness brought forward, by the assumption that the whole of creation had not, inherently, any sufficient holiness even to minister before Him. Out of the families of men, one was selected *arbitrarily*, to perform the ordinances of Divine service; and it became *holy on that account*. The idea to be generated being

the holiness of Jehovah, and the natural impurity of creation before Him, what process could more forcibly have taught this doctrine than the separation of one people, not the most mighty, and not noted for righteousness; making them holy, for no other reason than that Jehovah had taken them into covenant and connection with Himself? The ascription of a holy character to the whole people of Israel was a step towards the perfect holiness of Jehovah. But they were farther taught that only one step had been made; they were still at a great distance from Him. Another advance was exhibited. The one tribe of Levi was elected from the whole nation of Israel, just as Israel was chosen from the world; and to this tribe was assigned a still higher degree of holiness; it stood in the same relation to Israel, as Israel did to humanity. The peculiar privilege of the holy nation was to eat what came from God's table; the more sacred tribe handled the Divine furniture. Further again; out of this tribe the family of Aaron was elected to a still higher sanctity. Every Israelite, if clean, and not *cut off*, was privileged to eat with God; but he was not holy enough to sit down at God's table; he must wait outside until the priest, the mediator for that purpose between Jehovah and Israel, brought him his portion of the peace offering: or when, for the time, in the sin offering, an Israelite was exhibited as shut out from his holy privileges, it was the priest who eat as his proxy. But although the priest was so far holy that he could serve at God's table, he was not to enter into God's presence. The Shechinah dwelt in the inner chamber,

whither none but one person only, the most sacred High Priest, could ever go. He alone could pass the vail, and penetrate the gloom of God's adytum. Not that it was to be thought that even he was actually admitted into God's presence; but the gradual rising through the different stages, from the impure Gentile through the holy nation, the holier tribe, the still more holy family, to the most holy High Priest, was the only way to lead finite minds to contemplate the infinite qualities of Jehovah.

It ought to be well observed, that it is only by a similar process that the mind ever attempts to apprehend infinite distance. It first assumes some well-known and easily-perceived measure of space; and then proceeds, by the multiplication of this measure, till it rises to a quantity far above its own capacity. The earth's diameter, the orbit of the sun, the bewildering distance of the stars, cannot be at all understood, except as being so many smaller spaces repeated. And when the mind is wearied with such continued repetitions, and returns to its own smallness, it cannot idealise infinity, except through the confession that infinity is more than what, with all its labour and perplexity, it had striven to grasp. So also, we cannot now, and possibly we never shall be able to comprehend the holiness of Jehovah; but we know that after having advanced through successive gradations of human sanctity, we still cannot reach unto God. And as we are utterly unable to form an idea of the distance of one of the myriads of the nightly sheen, but by fancying ourselves to have traversed the whole orbit of our own planet, and discovering that we have made no

sensible approach to it ; so we could not, with all our efforts, conceive what God's holiness meant, but by gazing towards it from the highest step of created holiness, and bowing before what would ever be above us.

The Israelite's tabernacle and temple plainly typified this gradation of holiness. From the whole building itself every uncircumcised person was carefully excluded. He was, under no circumstances whatever, to advance beyond the outside porch. The Hebrew, who had not lost his privilege by uncleanness or extirpation, was admitted into the first court, called the court of the Israelites, whence he could witness the sacrifices. The mere Israelite was kept away from the court of the priests, where all the Divine service was performed, by a low wall, over which he might look, but beyond which only the sacred tribe might pass. This court was still outside the temple itself, into whose recess none but the High Priest could go.

We can thus trace, through the typical holiness of Judaism, a manifest design to shadow out the grand truth, that from the impurity of human nature man might rise *towards*, but not *unto*, the holiness of God^a.

^a For some very valuable remarks on this subject, the reader is referred to a little book, entitled 'Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation,' published by the Tract Society.

It ought to be borne in mind, as of essential importance to the subject in hand, that this distinction in *typical* holiness was to cease when Judaism ended. See especially the last two verses of Zechariah, who predicts, in his own florid and figurative language, that in the new dispensation the high-priest's insignia should be no more holy than bells upon horses (see also Hengstenberg's Christology on the passage).

It is of the greatest consequence, in order to a right understanding of the Levitical covenant, that we guard ourselves against the error of the later Jews, that they only were to be favoured by God, or that they were too good to associate with the uncircumcised, and were even defiled if they entered into the Gentile judgment-hall^a. For although this conceit retained so strong a hold on the Jewish mind, that when Peter went into the house of Cornelius (a Gentile, though a singularly devout one,) he deemed it necessary to make an explanatory defence of his conduct^b, yet no warrant whatever is found for this insolent exclusiveness in the Old Testament. And, as we shall see in the sequel, Paul was firm in resisting it as *unlawful*; while he was quite as firm in giving to the Jew all the privileges which were allowed to him by God.

The nation of Israel was holy, not for its righteousness, but because it was gifted with certain privileges, which remained while the Majesty of Jehovah was not hurt.

In the beginning of the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy, the Lawgiver, after specifying the accursed nations by name, with whom Israel was to have no intercourse, (and this minute specification implies that the ban of excommunication was limited to them; they were put not only out of the congregation of Israel, but out of the congregation of humanity;) proceeds to tell the nation that they were the holy, the chosen people of the Lord, not for anything they had to recommend themselves to Him; “for,” says he, “ye were the fewest of

^a John xviii. 28.

^b Acts xi. 1-18.

all people," but simply on account of God's covenant with them. Throughout the eighth chapter he exhorts them to righteousness, as to something deficient in their character. And then in the ninth chapter, he is express in declaring that they were not more righteous than others: "Understand, therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it, for thy righteousness, for thou art a stiffnecked people." And nevertheless he concludes, "Yet they are Thy people, and Thine inheritance."

It is evident therefore that the holiness he ascribes to Israel was quite irrespective of individual righteousness. Notwithstanding any sins, short of the national infraction of the covenant, Israel was still the holy nation. The sanctity was not only due to the privilege of serving before God, but it meant nothing else. This very manifest sense of the Old Covenant holiness is constantly lost sight of, and errors of the most destructive kind are caused. The election of Israel to be God's holy people (in the above sense) was entirely arbitrary, as St. Paul has argued in the ninth chapter of the Romans. But whence, in the whole Bible, can the doctrine be fetched, that *therefore* election to everlasting salvation is arbitrary? And although the nation had, besides, the privilege of being entrusted with God's oracles, wherein the Israelite was instructed how God dealt with man^a, yet so far from

^a Rom. iii. 1, 2. For some very valuable remarks on the difference between election to privilege, and election to salvation, the reader is referred to Archbishop Whately's 3rd Essay "on some of the difficulties in the writings of St. Paul."

The selection of clean animals seems to have been in a great mea-

St. Paul wishing us to believe that any arbitrary election to salvation was intended, he points out how the Jews had not secured the favour of God ; namely, not (as those, who read with their eyes shut, pretend) because God did not choose their salvation, but *because they had not fulfilled the conditions required*^a.

If the Old Covenant were, what is often imagined, a covenant of works, having regard to eternal salvation, the Jews would have been quite right in their fancies, and Paul could have made no pretence to have lived in all good conscience towards God^b, if he taught otherwise. But with what consistency can a Christian blame the Pharisee for doctrines which would undoubtedly have been true, had the Levitical covenant meant what they both interpret it to mean ?

So far from any authority being given for the assumption, that the Gentiles were not cared for, or that they were less holy, in respect of righteousness or of salvation, we find that, whenever *strangers* are mentioned in the Books of Moses, the Israelites were ordered to love them^c. There are, however, two kinds of strangers mentioned in the Old Testament : 1st, Those who were not in the covenant at all, who had no *Levitical* holiness ; no right to the federal sacrifices ; 2ndly, Those who, from

sure arbitrary ; that is, not always dependent upon any inherent qualities. As, for instance, the goat was ordinarily clean enough, not only for eating (Deut. xiv. 4), but for sacrifice (Numb. xxviii. 22) ; yet when symbolically laden with sins, it became unclean, and even imparted the uncleanness to him who touched it (Levit. xvi. 20-28).

^a Rom. ix. 32.

^b Acts xxiii. 1.

^c Exod. xxii. 21 ; Deut. x. 19. See also Michaelis Comment. Book ii. art. 61.

being Gentiles, had been circumcised, and become Israelites.

It is usual to call the first by the name of the Proselytes of the Gate; the second, by that of Proselytes of righteousness; and although some object to the name Proselyte as applied to Gentiles^a; yet, if we be careful to remember the very essential distinction between them, there can be no reason to discontinue a name sanctioned by the usage of the best authorities^b.

In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple, he seems to speak of strangers not of Israel coming and worshipping "towards this house" as a well-admitted custom; and the number residing in Canaan would appear to be greater than what is often supposed^c. That these strangers, who were for every purpose Gentiles, were sometimes religious men, and on that account in favour with God, although not part of the holy nation, and having no share in the Old Covenant, will scarcely be denied by any who regard Job as a righteous man. And even the Rabbis give a kind of reluctant acknowledgement that pious Gentiles may have a portion in the

^a Jennings, Jewish Antiquities, on Proselytes.

^b At the same time, it must be observed, that the above names are retained only for convenience sake. The Scriptures generally distinguish between *gār*, a sojourner or proselyte, *Judæus factus non natus*, as at Exod. xii. 19, 48, 49; Levit. xvii. 15, xxiv. 22; Numb. ix. 14; and the dispersed foreigner (*thoshab* or *zar*), as at Exod. xii. 45; Levit. xxii. 10; Numb. i. 51.

At some places, as at Exod. xx. 10, xxii. 21; Deut. x. 19, xxxi. 12, although the word *gār* is used, it is probable that uncircumcised strangers are meant.

^c 1 Kings viii. 41-43; and 2 Chron. ii. 17.

world to come^a. These pious non-Israelites are often referred to in the Acts of the Apostles as devout men (εὐσεβεῖς, σεβομένοι), or Greeks (Ἕλληνες), distinguished from idolatrous Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη)^b; and they ought not to have been treated with the pride that even Peter was disposed to evince towards them. The vision that declared God's will to him did not by any means teach a *change of custom*, but opened his eyes to the truth, that he ought never to call any man common or unclean.

But it must not be forgotten that the Law of Moses, itself intended only for the circumcision, did not sanction, or even tolerate, Gentile *wickedness*. The traditional list of ordinances which Proselytes of the Gate had to observe before they were permitted to dwell within the cities of Israel, was probably founded on the reasonable deduction from the Law, that the Jew must not associate with a

^a See Mede, Works, Book i. Discourse 3. It is not quite certain whether the following catalogue of those who have no portion in the world to come, given by Maimonides (Canones de Pœnitentiâ, cap. 3), refers to men generally, or to those who have fallen from the bosom of Israel, though No. 2 has such evident reference to Christians, that the Rabbi must either have meant his sentence of excommunication to be general, or he must have counted Christians as Jewish heretics:—1. Epicurei. Those who deny providence and prophecy. 2. Those who deny the divinity of the Law; or who say that the Law, although divinely given, has now ceased. 3. Those who deny the resurrection from the dead, or the coming of the Messiah. 4. Those who cause the whole congregation to sin. 5. Those who depart from the customs of the congregation. 6. Those who sin presumptuously (elatâ manu). 7. Those who betray their brothers in Israel. 8. Those who cause terror to the whole congregation, not for the sake of God. 9. Those who shed blood. 10. Those who slander. 11. Lastly, those who become uncircumcised.

^b Acts x. 1; xiv. 1; xvi. 14; xvii. 4, 17, &c.

notorious sinner, or one who was an *immoral* Gentile. These ordinances, commonly called the seven precepts of the sons of Noah, were: 1. To renounce idolatry; 2. To worship the true God; 3. Not to murder; 4. Not to be unchaste; 5. Not to steal; 6. To observe righteousness; 7. Not to eat flesh with the blood in it.

The Jewish Christians were at first probably in the same error with their countrymen, in thinking it unlawful for an Israelite to hold communion with a pious Gentile, and they were therefore obliged to suppose that a Gentile must become a Jew before he could become a Christian. The case of Cornelius, and the wisdom of Paul, prevented Christianity from being overwhelmed by Pharisaism; exploded the mistake of placing the Jew nearer to God's favour than the Gentile; and removed from all sincere minds the folly of an ancient covenant of works. The decision of the Apostles at Jerusalem amounted to this, when they declared that they would give the right hand of fellowship to all who believed in the Lord Jesus, whether Jews or Gentiles, if they renounced wickedness. The Gentile would have been a wicked man, and *therefore* not fit for a Christian, if he had refused to subscribe to "the seven precepts"; and for that reason, when they gave these seven precepts, "briefly reckoned up"^a as the

^a Mede, Book i. Discourse 3. I wonder that the above explanation by "the profoundly learned Joseph Mede" is not made more use of in considering the apostolic decree, which *otherwise* appears to confound together things important and unimportant. The above list of the seven precepts is taken from his works. Buxtorf gives them rather differently (*Lex. Chald. sub voce Gür*). See also Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History* (Davidson's Translation), § 26. note 6.

only *external* things a Gentile was to mind; or proclaimed that Christians must be proselytes of the gate; they were in fact authorising all that Paul insisted on, viz. that the Law of Israel never could afford justification, or qualify for individual acceptance with God. And in thus reprobating the Pharisaic covenant of works, and rejecting the insolent exclusiveness of the Rabbis, they were but treading in the footsteps of their Master, who did not refuse to associate with Gentiles^a.

The Gentiles then were unholy or unclean only in the sense we have been considering; they were not Israelites; they were neither in the Old Temporal Covenant, nor were they born with a right to the privileges of that covenant. But any Gentile was allowed to become an Israelite if he pleased (unless he belonged to one of the accursed nations). Such converts are called by Jewish writers, proselytes of righteousness, because they observed the whole Law, and were holy, as native Israelites. They were circumcised, and “differed nothing from Jews but only that they were of Gentile race (*facti non nati Judæi*)^b.” In the New Testament they are simply called Proselytes^c. Very little is said about these *strangers* in the Books of Moses beyond the permission to admit them^d; nor shall we wonder at this reserve when we remember that the Israelitish covenant was necessarily limited, although no man could say where the limit was to be

^a John xii. 20-36, and Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on the passage.

^b Mede, vol. i. Discourse 3. ^c Acts ii. 10, vi. 5, xiii. 43.

^d Gen. xvii. 27; Exod. xii. 48, 49; Numb. xv. 14-16; Deut. xxix. 11, &c.

placed. But that a wide spreading of Judaism would be accompanied by many inconveniences, and indeed destroy its whole character, is evident from the seeming necessity of the Alexandrian Jews to have a temple of their own. There was no inherent reason why an Hellenist, having no share in the covenanted blessings, should worship at Jerusalem. At the same time, by his absenting himself from the head-quarters of the nation, and by his abandonment of his territorial claims, Judaism became a dead letter to him. Having reference to the land of Canaan, and the worship belonging to it being altogether Jewish, it was to be expected that no express command should be given to oblige Gentiles to become Jews; while yet no one was prevented from a share in the covenant, *if he were so inclined*. In the later times of the people, this right to admit any stranger to circumcision seems to have been fully recognized^a. And the quarrel between Paul and his enemies will be found to turn upon this very point, whether Gentiles *might*, or *must*, be Judaized.

Connected with the subject of typical holiness, and satisfactorily explained by it, are the washings of the old religion. These bathings or baptizings are of such frequent occurrence, as to appear trivial to those not acquainted with the spirit of Judaism. They gave rise to the unauthorized conceit of the Scribes, that the washing itself

^a Esther viii. 17. The authorities for the above will be found in Buxtorf's *Lex. sub voce Gür*; Mede, vol. i. Disc. 3; Prideaux, *Connect. sub anno* 428; or in a convenient form in Jennings's *Jewish Antiquities*; or Beausobre's *Introd.*, under the subject "*Proselytes*."

The heathen authors who wrote about the Jews confirm this account. See Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5; Dio Cassius, lib. xxxvii. cap. 17.

was a virtue; and that, without regard to a transition from one state to a holier, any baptizings, such as the washing of the hands before eating, and the sprinkling of "cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables," recommended the ritualist to God.

Entirely opposed to this view of baptisms, the Old Scriptures never sanction washing as a religious ordinance, except as an outward representation of passing from an unclean to a comparatively clean state. The good obtained was not the baptizing, but the holy privilege signified by it. A careful consideration of this will account for many otherwise strange things, such as the washing of the High Priest (but not the common priests) when he entered on his office, as we shall presently see; and will, without doubt, throw great light on much of the ritual of the New Covenant, grounded as it was on that of the Old.

The use of water, for the purpose of sensibly exhibiting the transition from the unholy to the holy, or from the unclean to the clean, was both intelligible and easy. No one who was not determined to magnify the symbol above the spirit could ever mistake the meaning. To suppose that the sprinkling of water induced, *by itself*, God's grace, was left to the Pharisees or other formalists. In this as in other cases, the tradition of men who saw, in a passage from an unprivileged to a privileged state, a magical invocation of God, has made the Word of none effect to many. Let us see what the Word itself taught.

Whenever an Israelite had contracted a defilement of

such a nature as to exclude him from his privileges, and recovered from that defilement, he was always bound to *signify* that recovery by washing his flesh with water. He who touched an impure animal was himself unclean for a stated time ; and then, *at the expiration of that time*, he washed, to exhibit that he was now pure^a. The leper was unclean until he was healed of his leprosy, and then he washed in token of his being clean. The washing never could restore a diseased leper^b. There is not a single instance recorded of water possessing power of itself to restore any one to privilege ; it did no more than outwardly exhibit that such a restoration was to take place. It is not necessary to adduce many examples of this kind ; a reference to almost any part of the book of Leviticus will show that in all the ceremonial washings, as uncleanness meant loss of privileges, so the cleansing by baptism meant a restoration to those privileges. Thus, as the unclean Israelite was not admitted into the congregation, so the unclean priest could not perform the priestly office^c ; and in either case, when the privilege was regained, a baptizing was prescribed.

If a person did not perform the washing, he disobeyed a positive precept, and he remained in his uncleanness ;

^a Lev. xi. 27, 28, 43, 44.

^b Lev. xiii. xiv. ; see also Lev. xii. xv. The washing of Naaman in the Jordan was not a Levitical baptism ;—it signified no restoration to privilege. I deem it necessary to notice this, as it might otherwise seem an exception to what is asserted above. What I mean is this : that in the established ritual there was no declaration that washing, by itself, however faithfully performed, could give to an Israelite his privileges.

^c Lev. xxii. 6.

he forbore to take advantage of his privilege, and was therefore said to be "cut off," or to "bear his iniquity^a."

In exactly the same way, if any one passed from one state to a holier state, the transition was signified by baptism. Thus, when Aaron and his sons were created priests, they were washed^b, to denote that they were elevated from the privileges of mere Israelites to those of a more holy grade.

It seems to be the general opinion that every high priest was washed on his consecration; but the ordinary priest, being born to his office, and therefore not requiring consecration, did not also require baptism^c. And if this be true, which there is no reason to doubt, it is in strict accordance with the principles above enunciated; namely, that the act of baptizing denoted a passing into a state of holiness, in which the person previously was not. Every one of Aaron's male descendants was by and from his birth a priest; and unless he were raised to the pontificate, he always retained that privilege only. But the

^a Lev. xvii. 16.

^b Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6.

^c "The case of the High Priest differed from that of the common priests, who were never consecrated afresh after the original consecration of their fathers, the immediate sons of Aaron. The reason of this difference was, that the pontificate descended according to personal claims, but the priesthood by hereditary right. It is worthy of observation that the same custom prevailed also in the unction of kings. For among the Hebrews no kings were anointed, except those who were the first of their respective families that filled the throne, such as Saul and David (to say nothing here of Jehu), or those whose right to the throne was disputed, such as Solomon, Joash, Jehoahaz." (Outram on Sac., Disc. i. c. 5, translated by Allen.) Maimonides agrees with this opinion.

High Priest, not being born a High Priest, but elected out of the whole family, and thus gaining one additional degree of typical holiness, was baptized at his consecration.

So also, when the whole nation of Israel was brought into covenant with God, and thereby constituted a holy people, they were required to wash^a. At the same time we must not suppose that this baptism signified the Covenant; circumcision was the sign of that. Baptism, here as elsewhere, only denoted an admission to holy *privileges*. When Jehovah admitted Israel to the rights of the Covenant, He constituted them a holy nation, and all the children, ever afterwards born of those parents, were, by their birth, holy in this respect, that they were entitled to all the privileges of the Covenant, *when observed*. For which reason, succeeding generations of Israelites were never baptized, because they were already in the holiness, the passage to which such a baptism would signify; but they were all circumcised, because circumcision denoted, not the right to contingent privileges, but the direct enjoyment of them. It did not follow that, because every Israelite was born with a right to the Covenant, he should be born when the Covenant was in actual existence. The generation which conquered Canaan were not circumcised until they were about to cross the Jordan; that is, until they were about

^a Exod. xix. 10-14. Upon this subject see Wall's Introduction to "Infant Baptism." See also Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in 1 Cor. x. 1: "The Jews themselves confess that they were baptized at Mount Sinai."

to take possession of God's covenanted blessing ; but, being born of those people who had been made holy, they were holy also, and therefore not rebaptized.

In other words, God promised to the circumcised Israelites who left Egypt, that He would give them the land ; He made the Old Covenant with them ; and to denote their admission to this privilege, the whole nation was baptized. That circumcised generation perished in the wilderness, because they would not take possession of their rights. But all who were born during the forty years that the Covenant was suspended, holy as they were, were not circumcised until they entered Canaan ; because to them circumcision would have been unmeaning.

And it must not be omitted that this privilege still remains to the Jews, even though the Covenant is broken, and circumcision therefore insignificant. The exiled Hebrews are not *now* in the Covenant ; but if God's word is true, they are entitled to it whenever they fulfill the condition, a recognizing of the last manifestation of Jehovah ; and therefore they are still, in this sense, a holy people, and would not require any *Jewish* baptism.

It is in strict analogy with this view of baptism, that a Gentile, when he became an Israelite, was not only circumcised, to mark his then actual admission to the Covenant ; but he was also baptized, to signify that even if he should lose this privilege by his own or the nation's fault, he had still the right for himself and all his descendants to be re-admitted to the Covenant, whenever it should be re-established.

It has been often indeed remarked, that the Scriptures

are wholly silent on the baptism of proselytes, though certainly it seems to me that more difficulty has been made of this silence than there was any occasion for; because, for the reasons before stated, the Old Testament is purposely reserved on the entire subject of Proselytes, and there is therefore no wonder that details of admission are not given: and in the single passage^a, where strangers are positively said to have been made Jews, the silence respecting baptism should no more lead us to suppose that baptism was not practised, than the silence respecting circumcision should create a doubt whether these strangers were circumcised.

The opinion of all competent persons is unvaried, that the custom was to baptize all Gentiles who became Israelites^b. The New Testament does not mention it, because the Apostles, when the Old Covenant had been violated, would not allow any Gentile Christians to become Jews at all. A permission, *at that time*, that a Gentile *might* Judaize, would have had all the danger of

^a Esther viii. 17.

^b Buxtorf (Lexicon, *sub voce* Gär) says that proselytes were admitted formerly by circumcision, baptism and sacrifice; now, by circumcision and baptism: "and these two are so necessary, that he who neglects either of them shall not be considered as a proselyte."

Lightfoot (Harmony, part i. sect. 9. § 3): "Baptism had been in long and common use among them (the Jews) many generations before John Baptist came; they using this for admission of proselytes into the church, and baptizing men, women, and children for that end."

See also Hor. Heb. in Matt. iii. and Joh. iii.; Selden de Synedriis, lib. i. chap. 3; and De Jure Natural. et Gentium, lib. ii. cap. 4; Prideaux, Connect. *sub anno* 129; Ainsworth, Annot. in Gen. xvii. 12, &c.; but especially Wall's Infant Baptism, Introduction.

a command that he *must*. Indeed so certain appears to be the fact of proselytical baptism, both from direct testimony and from its close analogy with other washings, that I do not suppose any ever doubted it, unless he had sectarian ends in view^a.

The ceremony of baptism was so essential to the idea of transition from an unholy to a holy state, that the Jews appear to have expected they should all be re-baptized when the Messiah came; for there lurked, among even the traditionary doctors, a faint belief that the Messiah would originate a more holy state of things. Therefore the Jews did not express surprise that John, while announcing the approach of the Messiah, assumed the office of a Baptist^b.

It was the natural consequence of these several gradations of holiness, that any one who gained an advance was supposed to begin a new life; to be under a different relation to God and men. We may perceive some traces of this notion in the law which forbade the High Priest to mourn, as others did, for his nearest connections^c; inasmuch as he was supposed on his exaltation to be loosed, in some sense, from the ties of affinity which belonged to his previous state of a less holy person. It is not improbable that the command not to marry a widow was connected in some way with an exception made, in his case, to the general rule of taking a deceased brother's wife^d; namely, because she was not considered

^a See Gale's Answer to Wall's Infant Baptism.

^b Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Joh. i. 25. ^c Lev. x. 6; xxi. 10, 11.

^d Compare Deut. xxv. 5 with Lev. xxi. 14. See also Josephus, Antiq. book iii. chap. 12. § 2; Beausobre, Introd.

to bear the same relation to him that she would have done to a person in the same state of holiness with her first husband.

For precisely the same reason, when a Gentile passed to the condition of an Israelite, he was also considered to have renounced, in a great measure, the ties of blood, and to have commenced a new life. It is evident that when he became a Jew, he must have been considerably separated from his Gentile relations, and in a *typical* sense he was no longer their brother, although we need pay but little heed to the Rabbinical rule, that all relationship actually was at an end^a. We should indeed be more shocked by such rules, as that a proselyte might contract marriage with his nearest relative^b, had we not reason to suspect these decisions had reference rather to an imaginary than to a practicable case. The great Roman historian may perhaps not be speaking ignorantly, but only taking the Rabbinical fancies rather too literally, when he writes, that proselytes to Judaism "were imbued with nothing sooner than contempt of the gods, rejection of their country, and a vile estimation of parents, children and brothers^c."

But all this does not hinder the conclusion, that the

^a Selden (*De Jure Nat. et Gent.* lib. ii. cap. 4) quotes the following from a Jewish writer: "Whoever was related to a proselyte, when he was a Gentile, is plainly not related to him now." And Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. in Joh. iii. 3*) refers to Maimonides as saying, "All the relations which he had when he was a Gentile, or a slave, are not now his relations."

^b Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Acts xv. 20*.

^c Tacitus, *Hist. lib. v. c. 5*.

Jews were perfectly authorized in looking upon proselytes, recovered from the Gentiles, as men become holier ; and in one sense, commencing a new life ; and it is no wonder therefore that the technical word *regeneration*, always applied to this typical passage, should imply this typical birth. As the use of this word has given rise to lamentable divisions, it is of the most vital importance that we should have a correct notion of its true meaning when referred to the commencement of an Israelite's life. Such a supposed recommencement of life, having the word *regeneration* applied to it, is so natural, that we are in no way surprised that the same terminology prevails in the admission of proselytes to some Eastern religions^a. And I am not aware that any, not writing under strong doctrinal prejudice, have ever doubted the particular application which the contemporaries of our Lord made of the word.

I take the well-known authority of the writers under-quoted^b, as supporting the natural idea of the word itself, that Jews were accustomed to speak of proselytes ad-

^a See Wiseman's 11th Lecture, p. 395. So striking is the similarity in the use of this technical word, that it has been supposed that it passed from the East, with other gnosticisms, into the mystic language of the Pharisees. But it is much more probable that the frequent use of the same word for the same thing only proves the metaphor to be an easy one.

^b "The acquisition of the Jewish name, or Regeneration, or a participation in the right of a Jew, and the prerogative of an Israelite." (Selden, *De Jure Nat. lib. ii. cap. 4.*)

"But as a new name was given to a proselyte, so also was there a new birthday. So that as soon as he was initiated he was accounted regenerated." (*Ibid.*)

Selden also quotes the Talmud : "A proselyte, from the time that

mitted to all the privileges of Israelites, as regenerated ; and this I do, while I am utterly regardless of the magic follies which Pharisees and Pharisaists choose to tell us about what Regeneration means. The word itself is technical, and therefore if it is to remain technical, it can only be applied to the same acts as the original inventors applied it to ; while we need care nothing about any doctrines of theirs.

The Jews gave the name to the new life which an Israelitish neophyte commenced. And we shall attach, of course, such an idea to the word Regeneration as arises from our conception of what that life meant.

If the Jews thought that the privileges of an Israelite were, the monopoly of God's favour and the certainty of salvation, then they also exalted the ideality of Jewish regeneration to the same undue height that many modern religionists, resting upon the same wicked self-conceit, have done.

But if, as I have endeavoured to show, these privileges were : the being entitled to a share in the Old Covenant

he becomes a proselyte, is considered as an infant who is just born." (Gemara Babylon. ad tit. Jabimoth, cap. 2.)

"The Jews acknowledged a certain regeneration took place at the admission of a proselyte." (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Joh. iii. 3.)

Lightfoot quotes from Maimonides : "A Gentile who becomes a proselyte, and a slave who is manumitted, behold he is like a little child just born." (Issurei Biah. cap. 14.)

For further authorities, see Wall's Introduction to his Infant Baptism, where the subject is pursued most satisfactorily, at great length.

We may recognize an idea of the same kind in the Roman custom of a manumitted slave taking the name of some other family than his own.

blessings, when (and only when) the Old Covenant was in force,—and being therefore holy,—then Jewish regeneration, while applied still to the same transition, namely the commencement of the Israelite life, denotes the putting down of the name in God's book, as a claimant for the sacred privilege of ministering before Him, and receiving the temporal covenanted gifts whenever the nation should observe its terms and publicly acknowledge Jehovah.

If this be evident, a comparison of the terms and privileges of the Gospel Covenant with those of Israel after the flesh, will readily suggest the meaning of Christian regeneration, and the time when it takes place.

CHAPTER IV.

A FUTURE STATE.

WE have seen that Judaism, properly understood, was connected only with temporal and national sanctions; that, according to Warburton's proposition, the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments did not make part of the Mosaic dispensation.

To assert the contrary,—to contend that the Jewish Law taught a spiritual religion, or was based upon the hopes of heaven, is preposterous. There is nothing to lead to such a fancy, beyond the almost universal ignorance of the Old Covenant, commencing with the traditionary Scribes, and reappearing, in one form or another, in nearly all the theological schools that have distracted Christendom.

But, while it is beyond doubt that the author of 'The Divine Legation' saw clearly one property of Judaism, its temporal sanctions; it is wonderful that he did not look deeper, and perceive the other equally important particular, its entirely national character. When this radical defect in Bishop Warburton's demonstration is corrected, all the objections to regard the Old Covenant as only temporal, will be removed from every unprejudiced mind.

I have never met with a more astonishing spectacle, than the accomplished Warburton, in his impetuous de-

fence of a truth, overlooking what would complete that truth, and resorting in consequence to shallow arguments and personal invective to support it. And on the other hand we must regret the rigid orthodoxy of the Bishop's opponents, who were arguing, not for truth, but for vain traditions, and who shut their eyes to the value, equally as to the real error, of the system which they condemned.

Warburton's one error was, the understanding that Judaism had reference to individuals. He supposed it necessary to his demonstration of the Divine Legation of Moses, that he should show how the Jewish Lawgiver was able to threaten a visible interference for transgressions of His Law. Now I have endeavoured to prove that, in regard to the national infringement of the national covenant, such a visible interference was not only plainly threatened, but that it invariably took place; and this would have been quite sufficient to establish the Divine Legation. But for individual transgressions; in the first place it will soon appear that the supposition of a threatened miraculous interference is a mistake; and, in the second place, no one has yet found out any relation of the actual accomplishment of such a threat.

An *extraordinary* providence over individuals, by which seems to be meant a miraculous punishment for every particular violation of the Law, would, in the end, defeat its own purpose. By being constant, it would lose much of the value of a miracle, and would entirely destroy anything like moral discipline or even responsibility. It is utterly inconceivable how any man could have offended, if every offence were visited with an immediate Divine

interference. Where would be the faith in believing? where would be the wondering at the prosperity of the wicked?

To suppose, moreover, that in the statute-book, whose laws held good for fifteen centuries, God would definitively engage to interfere miraculously in those cases of moral turpitude to which human laws could not reach, is to suppose that God engaged to do what He did not execute. The very fundamental idea of God is truth; if He so threatened, He must punish; yet who will point out the punishment? This very pressing objection to Warburton's system was urged against it by Sykes; and, in spite of the Bishop's anger, it was admitted by himself. But he evades it by replying that this extraordinary providence admitted of exceptions^a. That is, when his object was to prove that God so governed the Israelites, that they might, from that government, recognize the God who directed it; he yet confesses that such a recognition was not always possible.

But the truth is, that, far from there being only "some few exceptions" to this extraordinary providence of particulars, there is not a single instance recorded of God punishing miraculously individual cases *in consequence* of His having threatened to do so. I do not deny the very frequent immediate interference of Jehovah; but I do deny that such an interference was the regularly established order. In fact, these miracles were the "exceptions," as they must always, by their very nature, be to the ordinary moral or legislative government; proving

^a Divine Legation, book v. note A A.

quite sufficiently for Warburton's purpose, that God was watching over Israel, by His allowing miracles, when they were needed.

It must be evident that the only real cases adduced of the *threatening* of Divine interference, such as the sending of pestilence, blasting, locusts, &c.^a, had reference to the nation. Is it credible that such punishments, as the making the whole land desolate, should be denounced against every individual's offence? And although Warburton has mentioned one case of a threatened *individual* punishment^b, which succeeding writers have multiplied, yet a very slight consideration of the subject will show that a Divine interference could not have been meant.

The dogmatic assertion that such crimes as the making an oil like the sacred oil^c; the eating of the peace offering, while unclean^d; the contempt of the ordinances of the day of atonement^e; the refusal to celebrate the passover^f; the sin of presumption^g; or the offering of one's seed to Moloch^h (which last is the only case instanced by Warburton); were threatened with temporal punishment by God, because they were of a nature easily to escape detectionⁱ,—might be listened to, if there was any account preserved of even one such crime being so visited. But as no account of the kind can be discovered, it is fair to presume that the threatened *cutting off* did

^a Divine Legation, book v. sect. 5.

^b That mentioned at Lev. xx. 3. See Div. Leg. vi. 3. § 6.

^c Exod. xxx. 33.

^d Levit. vii. 21.

^e Levit. xxiii. 29.

^f Numb. ix. 13.

^g Numb. xv. 30.

^h Levit. xx. 3.

ⁱ Warburton's Divine Legation, book vi. sect. 3. § 6; and Dean Graves on the Pentateuch, Part iii. Lecture 3.

not mean a miraculous punishment. Indeed, as I shall presently show, there is strong ground for supposing these expressions to contain no obscure intimation of other punishments than the Law of Moses took cognizance of. And nothing appears more obvious to me, than that if these threats were understood to refer to an extraordinary providence in particulars; then if any one escaped unhurt when he did not keep the passover, or when he sinned presumptuously, which must often have been the case; these mere threats, far from proving the Divine Legation, would have proved that God could not have given the Law, because his words were not found to come true.

It is indeed surprising that Dean Graves, whose otherwise admirable exposition of the Pentateuch is marked by considerable ingenuity, should have taken for granted that the expression “cut off” in these places could mean the suffering of a temporal miraculous death: 1st, because the usually admitted signification of that phrase is banishment or excommunication^a; and 2ndly, because, in addition to the above negative proof, of a fulfillment of that supposed miracle being never mentioned, there is one instance recorded of an exactly similar threat, which may actually be shown not to mean a miraculous punishment. It is laid down as a law, that “every one that defileth the sabbath shall be surely put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be *cut*

^a Rosenmüller, Scholia in Gen. xvii. 14; Lightfoot, Temple Service, viii. 2; Michaelis' Laws of Moses, book iii. art. 110 and book v. art. 237; and Warburton himself, book v. sect. 5.

off from among his people^a." Here then is a threat of exactly the same kind as the preceding; and if there be any truth in the supposition that such a threat was to execute a miraculous punishment, we shall find it accomplished when the law was broken. In this case there is a particular relation of an infringement: in the man who was detected in gathering sticks on the sabbath^b. Yet no miracle was wrought; the congregation were in doubt whether his act constituted a violation of the Law; and as soon as they were satisfied, they put him to death; but never looked for a miraculous visitation. Whereas, on the principles of Dean Graves, if they thought God had threatened to visit such a transgression, while yet they found that He did not do so, they would not have needed any further inquiry: they ought to have been certain that the law had *not* been violated.

As I have before said^c, such an expression as being *cut off from the people, or from Israel, or from the congregation*, means nothing more than that there was no atonement made in the Law for these offences. In such a crime as that of the open sabbath-breaker, in addition to this, the criminal was punished by the civil magistrate. It is fair to state that, in laying down as a positive truth that there is no account mentioned of an actual Divine interference which had been threatened, there is one apparent exception; not indeed to the *fulfillment*, but to the *utterance* of such a threat. In the law for the trial of a suspected wife by the bitter waters^d, every com-

^a Exod. xxxi. 14.

^b Numb. xv. 32-36.

^c Page 67.

^d Numb. v. 11-31.

mentator assumes this to contain a threat of Divine interference. Yet in this singular law, so unlike the Mosaic institutions, I cannot but suspect there is some misunderstanding. For, putting aside the strangeness of a permission to any weak-minded tyrant to subject an innocent woman to so degrading a trial, and to escape without any punishment himself, however unfounded his charge might be, it is clear that the imprecated punishment, even if it took place, could not have been discovered, except by the woman herself; 1st, from the expressions made use of*; 2ndly, because she could not have been judged to have been thus punished, until all hope of child-bearing were removed, which no one could certify; and 3rdly, because if her punishment were public, she ought by the law to suffer death, which it is clear that she did not.

I would not venture any exact explanation of such an extraordinary law, but it appears to me that the true view of the matter may very possibly be simply this: if a husband suspected his wife, *she* was allowed to take a very solemn oath that the suspicions were unfounded, and to imprecate upon herself some dreadful curses, if she was perjured. The expression that *she should bear her iniquity* shows that she was not punished, but only a punishment was hanging over her. And even admitting, which I do not, that God positively engaged to punish her publicly, yet this would not interfere with what I have advanced; because not only is no instance of such a punishment recorded, but it was generally per-

ceived that it was not to be expected ; for which all kinds of fanciful reasons are alleged ^a.

I have deemed it of the greatest importance to show upon what slender grounds Warburton could rest his theory, that God governed Israel by miraculously punishing individual transgressions, because the room is then left open for the doctrine of a future life coming in, as it always must *first* come in, from natural religion. If such a government had been established, who could have blamed the Sadducees for rejecting the doctrine? Because if God's government were complete here (which it then would have been), where would be the need of any hereafter? But, in truth, a reflecting Israelite would readily enough discover that if God exhibited his providence in the national covenant, and did not do so in individual cases, the exhibition was yet to come ^b ; which

^a Joseph. Antiq. book iii. chap. 11 ; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Joh. viii. ; Michaelis' Laws of Moses, book v. art. 263.

^b The temporal threats upon the nation are as remarkable as the omission of any such upon individuals. To take an instance :—

It was commanded expressly that the future king of Israel should not multiply either his horses or his wives (Deut. xvii. 16, 17). Solomon multiplied both : yet in respect of the wives, the sin was his own ; there was no *temporal* punishment. His heart was turned away, but he did not lose anything worldly in consequence (1 Kings xi. 4).

On the other hand, in the sin of multiplying horses (1 Kings iv. 26, x. 26–29 ; 2 Chron. i. 14–17, ix. 24, 28), in which the *nation* was concerned, there is not even a hint dropped that he was wrong ; he certainly was not personally punished for it. Whereas, transgressing, as ruler and representative of the nation, the sin was national, and so was the punishment ; which is evident from the history, although not expressed in words. For before Solomon's time, the nation, with no war-horses, were singularly fortunate in

is the great argument we can have for a future life at all : it is urged by St. Paul in the opening part of the Epistle to the Romans^a, and is thus stated by a writer to whom (in spite of his heterodoxy) sufficient justice has never yet been done : "It is certain, in fact, that the good and evil of this life is promiscuously dispensed ; and good men suffer evil things, and evil men receive good things. Take this fact by itself, and turn it over ever so often, and it is impossible to know whether the conclusion be, either that there is no just governor of the universe, or that there is to be a future state of recompense. But suppose a man convinced of the truth of this proposition, that God exists, a good and just and wise Being ; and that then he comes to consider the unequal dispensation of things, the consequence will then be certain that the present cannot be the whole of our existence, but that there must be a state when all these inequalities will be made up^b."

It is evident that this argument would apply with much greater force to an Israelite than to any one else ; not only because the national dealings were so extraordinary with him, but also because all possibility of mistake, in considering an unequal present Providence, was removed from him. Another man would fear lest his own prejudice or ignorance might mislead him. But an unequal Providence was established by God Himself over individual Israelites (let Warburton theorise as he pleases), battle ; yet after his time, when they had a cavalry, they were as remarkably unfortunate (see Michaelis' *Laws of Moses*, appendix to art. 166).

^a Rom. i. 18 to ii. 16.

^b Sykes, *Connection of Nat. and Rev. Religion*, chap. 2.

in the very fact of a national covenant ; inasmuch as it was expressly ordained that unrighteous and righteous men had all the same share of the national blessings. The most wicked Israelite who crossed the Jordan with Joshua, if he kept from transgressing his country's laws, was quite as much temporally favoured as the most pious. In any of the captivities, the good have been involved in the same punishment with the bad ; not in a mere order of events, but because God had engaged that it should be so.

The usual way of stating this argument is not of sufficient force. True, it must have seemed wonderful that Moses, for one small fault, should have lost all the covenanted blessings ; and this same wonder exists now, whenever we perceive, as we think, the undeserved unhappiness of a good man. But in Israel, God actually *engaged* to deprive (in some instances) a righteous man of temporal good ; and how any one who knew what the Old Covenant was, and at the same time was persuaded by it that He was a watchful God, could avoid the necessary inference that there should be a day of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God, is to me quite unaccountable.

And I think that this view of the matter will lead us to those passages in the Law of Moses, where an allusion may be supposed to be made to a future life ; for no one, untainted with Pharisaism, would venture to assert that the doctrine is taught there, or even plainly mentioned in any one passage.

Various reasons have been assigned for this singular

omission. Men who look upon Judaism as a masked mystery ; who can gather spiritual doctrines from any words however unspiritual ; and whose purpose the Vedas or the Zendavest would answer every bit as well as the Bible ; easily get rid of the whole difficulty, when they think that God ought to have revealed Himself according to their theories ; and are determined that their own initiated minds shall see the doctrine of a future life, where they confess, candidly enough, that the carnal eye cannot read it. They imitate the Jews, who look to the Law of Moses as containing all things necessary to salvation ; and who are not satisfied of the orthodoxy of a believer in the resurrection from the dead, unless he also believe that “ it is taught by the Law^a. ”

Those who understand Judaism more correctly, as a discipline for Christianity, and do not look for peculiarly Christian doctrines in it, but for such as would prepare the world for Christianity, suggest, with great ingenuity and probability, that it was the object of Moses to represent Jehovah in a character altogether different from what the pagan mind represented Him. The idolatrous nations were quite ready to admit a supreme passive governor like Jehovah, the first cause of all ; but the gods whom they worshiped, and who were supposed to interest themselves with human concerns, were the im-

^a See Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, liv. ii. A remarkable instance of *forcing* the Law to speak of a future life, is at Deut. xxii. 7, where “ the prolonging of the days ” is declared to mean “ a lengthening out to eternity. ” See Maimonidis *Moreh Nevochim*, iii. 27 ; *Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 8. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* xxii. 32, et in *Act.* xxiii. 8.

pure and limited creations of man's own fancy. And, as the especial design of the Law was to eradicate polytheism, both in theory and practice, it was necessary that in it Jehovah should appear as exercising the same functions as were attributed to the lesser gods ; visiting mankind temporally^a.

The origin of idolatry seems to have been, not so much a dethroning of God, as a putting of some inferior being, more nearly resembling men, between the Great God and the worshiper. There was felt a want (and the want was natural) to have a mediator, some one partly man and partly God, who could sympathise with humanity, and direct the affairs of this lower world. The consequence was that, while The God was banished to a distance, and was supposed to enjoy a merely passive existence, absorbed in the contemplation of Himself, men worshiped Bacchus and Brahma, Moloch and Apis, as deputy governors of a world too mean for the Great Spirit to be intimately connected with. So that if Moses had spoken of Jehovah only as the supreme governor, and the final arranger of disorder in another life, polytheists might have not denied this God, and yet have been in no way disturbed in their paganism. There would have been no more effect wrought than already existed in every heathen system, however extravagant ; where there was always admitted the supreme God. But, for the reasons before stated^b, this swarm of lesser gods

^a Hyde de Relig. Pers. lib. i. Dean Graves on the Pentateuch, Part ii. Lowman's Hebrew Ritual.

^b Chap. III. page 73.

were to be rooted out before the world could receive Christianity ; and therefore to make their worship quite inexcusable, Jehovah appeared as doing what they would have done ; rewarding and punishing men visibly.

Now, although this idea tends towards clearing up the difficulty, why the doctrine of a future life is not made prominent in the Pentateuch, yet I cannot think it a sufficient answer to the question why the doctrine is not mentioned at all. In truth, this idea does nothing beyond satisfying us of the necessity of making a temporal covenant with the Hebrews ; and then, whenever the covenant is concerned, temporal sanctions only can be spoken of. Few persons seem to understand that being national, Judaism was necessarily temporal ; because nations, as such, have no resurrection from the dead. And then we may not wonder, that in the book of Genesis, which describes the origin of the Covenant ; in the four last books of the Pentateuch, which detail its laws ; in Joshua and Judges, which exhibit its fulfillment ; in Samuel and Kings, which show its decay and dissolution ; in Ezra and Nehemiah, which are occupied with its re-establishment ; the doctrine of a future state should not appear prominently. But still it is strange that in relations where the Old Covenant was not concerned, in the personal faith of the worthies of old, no mention at all of such a grand hope should occur.

Some indeed try to solve the difficulty, by looking upon the Laws of Moses as mere civil decrees, and even think it would have been as ridiculous for the Resurrection to be dragged into the books, as for a modern act of

parliament to "denounce the pains of hell as the punishment of a crime^a." But not to insist here on the utter hopelessness of regarding the Mosaic institutions as only a collection of civil laws, the difficulty of not finding this wished-for doctrine, where these laws were not directly concerned, is not removed. And indeed such reasoners seem to have overlooked the important circumstance, that the force of Warburton's argument is applied only to those crimes which the ordinary law could not reach unto.

Look upon the matter as we will, the truth, disagreeable as it may be, cannot be gainsayed, that this doctrine was *designedly obscured*. So far Warburton has every show of reason on his side. But he has been strangely mistaken in the notion that Moses wrote expressly to destroy the belief in this doctrine; for he supposes himself able to gather from the Pentateuch that Moses believed it, and yet denies that ability to the contemporaries of the Lawgiver, with whom the language was vernacular, and the customs familiar. He himself, with some inconsistency, allows that the law against necromancy must have implied, "in the Lawgiver who forbids it, as well as in the offender who uses it, the knowledge of a future state^b." And moreover, if the doctrine were introduced afterwards, then the Pharisees, far from rendering the word of God of none effect by their traditions, would have done the greatest possible good by them, in teaching what the word of God by

^a Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, book i. art. 14.

^b *Divine Legation*, book v. Appendix.

itself could not teach. And where would be the justice of our Saviour's rebukes to the Sadducees for erring greatly in not knowing it? These considerations ought to have great weight in supporting our abhorrence of Warburton representing Moses, not only as concealing a truth, but as taking great pains to inculcate an error.

But, admitting that Moses concealed the truth designedly, that is, did nowhere expressly mention it, why should we hesitate in believing the intention of God who worked in this lower revelation, to be, that men should find it out for themselves? Far from there being any difficulty in such a belief to me, I am certain that I can collect the doctrine myself from the Levitical system more easily than men usually gather it from natural religion. Such an intention would be strictly analogous with what God usually does. For instance, Jesus concealed (in the same sense) the Atonement from his disciples; but He certainly did never mean them to believe the contrary. Indeed the difficulty, so often made, of our Saviour's allowing the whole doctrine of the Atonement to come gradually unto the disciples, instead of expressly describing it; and again, of bringing in the theory of Gentile Christianity very slowly, instead of promulgating a decree concerning it from the beginning, is of exactly the same nature as the difficulty in question; namely, the not actually teaching the Resurrection, but so revealing part of the truth, that a sincere inquirer would necessarily see this doctrine implied.

And there is nothing which to my mind carries such a weight of evidence, that the Bible is the work of Him

who made me, as the conviction that in this Book, God is represented as revealing all essential truth concerning Himself in exactly a similar way as He reveals Himself in nature and in human consciousness. God does not write His name on the heavens, in a language that every man, without inquiry or patience, could read; and the coarse atheist may, if he choose, deny the very existence of God upon that ground; and yet His name is written everywhere in characters that patient attention and comparison can decipher. He does not proclaim, by a loud voice, that He takes care of men; but, notwithstanding the general refusal to listen to any other voice, the religious man is satisfied that enough has been uttered to enable him to hearken. So too in the doctrine of the Resurrection, the wilfully blind cannot see it in the Law of Moses, because the very words "there shall be a resurrection unto life after death" are not written down. But he who will attend and reflect, must arrive at the conclusion, that such a revelation as the Mosaic could never have been proposed by God, if He had not designed that man should himself, *by its means*, become persuaded of another inheritance. It ought therefore to be carefully remembered, that the establishment of a temporal and national Covenant was the surest way of convincing men of a future state of retribution. The mere announcement of such a state would only be received by the faithful; whereas the Jewish economy tended to implant this faith. Temporal dealings proved to all the world that God was watchful and retributive. National visitations showed that the Jewish

Covenant could not be all. And enough being thus revealed for pious investigation, God did not destroy moral choice, or moral discipline, by miraculously preventing the careless and the profane from going wrong.

This view, while it sets aside both Warburton's ungrounded notion of such miraculous prevention, and, at the same time, the common mystical interpretations, is to my own mind quite satisfactory, and raises feelings of love and devotion to God, who has preserved the Bible.

And, in corroboration of these views, it will be noticed, that in Paul's reasonings on the resurrection, he supposes man to have already acquired, from his own observation, the knowledge of a future life. In the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, he points out how, *by natural deduction*, we may strongly suspect a coming day of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God ; and upon this natural conjecture he founds his whole argument. Supposing the probability of this truth, he shows that Christianity just answers the expectation of it. But chiefly I ground this view of the mode of looking for a life after death in the Books of Moses, upon the certainty that Jesus and his disciples took this view. It will be utterly in vain to look for any literal quotations of the resurrection in the New Testament out of the Old ; and it is surprising that this circumstance does not at once remove from the minds of allegorising Christians any expectation of the kind. And, on the other hand, there can be no doubt that the writers assume that the Jews ought to have known this doctrine ; or else, why did Jesus rebuke the Sadducees for not knowing it ? And

the consideration of one remarkable passage in the Saviour's life will clearly show that He taught a resurrection implied, when not mentioned, in the Jewish Scriptures. It seems to have been in consequence of our Lord's later parables, referring to the rewards and punishments of another life, that the Sadducees pressed Him, as they had no doubt often successfully pressed their scholastic opponents, with a very ingenious difficulty. Jesus not only put aside this difficulty, but also declared to them, that they greatly erred in not deducing this doctrine from the Scriptures; and grounded this declaration upon what God said to Moses, that He was the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, who were dead; because He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, *for all live unto Him*^a. And hereupon, the crowd of commentators exclaim that this argument is very forcible, because God represented Himself as the God of Abraham, &c., at the particular time when He spoke to Moses: therefore Abraham, &c. were alive when He so spoke; therefore men lived after death. Now, without any deep inquiry, it appears to most persons who read this passage in the Gospels, that the argument, so represented, is weak and unworthy; which could scarcely have silenced the subtle Sadducees, or called forth the admiration of the Pharisees.

But when, on further inquiry, it is known that the Sadducees were accustomed to hear from the Pharisees similar but more ingenious arguments drawn from the

^a Matt. xxii. 23-34; Mark xii. 18-27; Luke xx. 27-39. The passage quoted from the Law is in Exodus iii. 6.

exact words of the Law^a, we begin to suspect that the Sadducees did not understand Jesus to apply such an argument to them. And when, on looking to the Hebrew original, we see no expression whatever to denote time, we do not doubt that there is great injustice done to the character of Jesus in supposing him to have adopted a poor Rabbinical sophistry. And not only is the Hebrew original totally devoid of any mark of time, but we find farther, that although the Septuagint and St. Matthew put in the word *εἰμ*, yet the more critical Mark and Luke omit it, which they could not have done if the force of the argument depended upon it^b.

Our Saviour had a far deeper and more persuasive meaning than this. When He said so solemnly that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him; He intended to teach that if God was their God, He would have blessed them. They did not obtain the covenanted blessings; and therefore, if they died everlastingly, He was less their God than He was of the prosperous wicked^c.

^a See the quotations at note ^a, page 115.

^b The quotation is again made in Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 32), still with the omission of *εἰμ*.

^c I do not wish to affect any singularity in the above explanation. Most readers of the Bible, who are accustomed to reflect, understand that meaning.

"What is the point of Christ's proof? Is it not this, that when God places Himself in so close a relation to any man, as to call Himself *the God of that man*, there is conveyed in the very words the eternity of such a man?" (Tholuck's Introd. to the Hebrews, chap. 6; and his Annotation on Heb. xi. 13.) See also Neander's Life of Jesus, § 248; and Lowman's Hebrew Ritual, Part iii. chap. 1.

Those who would like a Calvinistic authority, I beg to refer to Witsii Econ. Fœd. lib. iii. cap. 2. sec. 1-5.

So sensible are commentators of the weakness of the supposed argument drawn from the word *am* (which, remember, is not in the Hebrew, nor in Mark, nor in Luke), that they suppose Jesus was limited in the parts of Scripture from which he could quote ; because, as is said, the Sadducees received only the Law and not the Prophets, and therefore He could not refer, for *their* satisfaction, to the Prophets, where the doctrine is more plainly declared. It does not however seem to strike these reasoners, that if this were the cause of His using a weak argument, it proves that only weak arguments could be founded upon the Law. And moreover, it is entirely a modern assumption that the Sadducees so rejected the Prophets as not to listen to any arguments from them. They did, indeed, in common with all the mistaken Jews, give a much greater authority to the Law than to the other parts of Scripture^a; and even, in scholastic theology, were not content unless they could prove a doctrine out of the Law. But, in the dispute with Jesus, it was not a mere

^a “The Sadducees did not absolutely reject any of the sacred books. They looked upon them as books composed by holy men, whose names they venerated. They did not, however, give to them the same authority as to the Law of Moses. That alone was the rule of their faith ; and all that was not extracted from the Pentateuch was not regarded as a fundamental article of religion.” (Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, liv. ii. chap. 14.)

“The Sadducees might learn indeed, from the Scribes and Pharisees themselves, to give a greater share of honour to the Pentateuch than to the other books, for even they did so.” (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Act. xxiii. 8.)

Josephus says nothing about the Sadducees rejecting the other books (*Antiq.* xiii. 5. 10, and xviii. 1 ; *Bell.* ii. 8).

The opinion has only arisen from the supposition that Jesus chose a weak argument from the Law.

question of orthodox divinity : Is this doctrine to be found in the Law ? but, Is there any evidence at all that there is a Resurrection ? And a good quotation from the Prophets, if their authority was at all admitted, would have decided the point much more effectually than an obscure sentence from the Law, however gratifying it would have been to know that Moses confirmed the Prophets.

And therefore it is not to be doubted, both from the nature of the question itself and from the effect produced, that the proof which Jesus made was not obscure ; nay, was the most persuasive possible. It was not one detached passage of Scripture, which dogmatic prejudice might make to support itself, but it was the sense of the whole of God's revelation. It is not conceivable that God would have made a merely temporal and national covenant, and yet have not engaged to give other blessings to His friends who never shared in that covenant.

The eleventh chapter of the Hebrews speaks the same lesson. In relating the faith which distinguished the worthies of old, the author lays down as an evident axiom, that if they came to God, they must have believed that " He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him^a" ; or they could have had no inducement to persevere through the loss of temporal good. Abraham sojourned in the land of promise, *as in a strange country* ; that is, he knew he was not himself to receive this promise ; and therefore he must have looked for a city which hath foundation, whose builder and maker is God ; that is, he was expecting *future* blessings. Similarly his descendants,

^a Heb. xi. 6.

who confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth^a, that they had no home, and therefore did not personally receive the promise of the land, made it clear^b that they were still seeking for some country. It could not have been the covenanted Canaan that they were seeking, because they might have obtained that, if they had been so minded; it was therefore a better, *i. e.* a heavenly country.

The argument plainly is, that, although no actual mention is made of a future life, the conduct of the patriarchs *evinces* (ἐμφανίζει) that they expected it. And it appears that the negative testimony of all the New Testament is on the same side. But there is one passage which is sometimes made to teach that the doctrine of a future state was unknown before Jesus. It is from St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, where it is said that our Lord "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light^c." Now, in the first place, this passage cannot mean that the doctrine was unknown before Jesus, because Daniel knew it and made no secret of it; the Pharisees, and nearly all the Jews, held it as a fundamental article of faith; the Sadducees were blamed for not believing it. And indeed any one who would found such an opinion upon the passage in question, could scarcely have read it in the original: which means, that "Jesus not only rendered our temporal death inoperative,

^a Heb. xi. 13. The allusions are to Gen. xxiii. 4, xxviii. 4, xlvii. 9.

^b Heb. xi. 14. ἐμφανίζω, to render evident, either by word or action; not to assert.

^c 2 Tim. i. 10.

but also threw a great light upon, or rendered certain, our incorruptible life, by means of the Gospel." Christ's death enabled men to rise again^a, and gave an additional evidence to the fact of another life. But the Apostle never intended that Jesus was the first to make known the expectation of a future state^b.

Understanding therefore, from every consideration, that we may expect a future life *implied* in the Law, it will not be difficult to point out those passages where the implication appears. For since the *Mosaic* revelation was both temporal and national, while individual Israelites must have expected something else; then, if there is at any place a threat held out to an individual, where no connexion can exist with the national covenant; and if it is clear that punishment by the civil magistrate cannot

^a Burton's note on 2 Tim. i. 10. But see especially Tholuck's very valuable remarks on Heb. ii. 14.

^b As Warburton seems to assume, though I confess that the Divine Legation, after all, would tend to establish the very things I am here contending for; but it is difficult, in many places of it, to separate the proofs, that Moses taught in *his revelation* only temporal sanctions, from the assertions that the ancient body of Jews knew of no other; particularly as the learned Bishop, in his controversial heat, often contradicts himself in the latter point. What a pity that he, advocating a truth, should have resorted to false or frivolous arguments! Who but himself (book v. sect. 6) would ever interpret 1 Tim. iv. 8, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come," to mean that godliness under the Old Dispensation was promised temporal blessings, and under the New, eternal rewards? What a wonderful prejudice to suppose that Paul is making any allusion to the Old Dispensation! What blindness to see, even in the Old Dispensation, any temporal promises to *personal* godliness, which are not now also promised!

be meant, then some future punishment by God *must* have been implied. If indeed Warburton could show one instance of such a kind of threat being fulfilled in this life; or if such an hypothesis did not strangely interfere with our primary notions of God's *uniform* government, and of his truth (since such a supposed design would have led men into error); if everything did not lead us to look for a future life being implied in this revelation; we might perhaps doubt whether Warburton's assumption were true. But the very ambiguous form in which such threats are couched, proves that God only intended to produce a general impression that His vengeance was impending, and if it did not reach the sinner in this life, he must expect it in the next.

I do not for an instant hesitate to refer all such threats, as *the offender's iniquity being upon him*, or *the Lord reserving him for evil*, or *setting his face against him*, following after the declaration of excommunication, to an implication of a future state of punishment. For looking upon the expression of "*being cut off*," as indicating that the offence was unpardonable by the satisfaction of the sin offering, we are given to understand that it had yet to be punished. In some cases, as in that of the open sabbath-breaker, who committed an offence cognizable at a human tribunal, not only was it not to be pardoned by means of a legal atonement, but the magistrate was directed to put the offender to death^a.

There were some cases, chiefly of a ritual nature, such as we have mentioned above^b, and which Dean Graves,

^a Exod. xxxi. 14, 15; compare Numb. xv. 32-36. ^b Page 108.

from whose acquaintance with the Pentateuch one might have looked for a better understanding of the great lenity of the Mosaic law, improperly and unfoundedly presumes to have been punished with death, but which were visited only with a separation from the congregation.

But in those cases where there was *moral* turpitude, not only was the legal sacrifice of no avail, but, if the magistrate could not punish, any false hope of final impunity was taken away by such threats as ; the Lord would set his face against offerers of human victims, or even the conniver at his wickedness^a; or that the presumptuous sinner should bear his iniquity^b. I do not mean to fall into the mistake of the Rabbis, or of Warburton's opponents, of taking these expressions for actual declarations of the punishments of hell^c; yet, inasmuch as they declare that God had other punishments in store than the national or civil ones, there would be a strong suspicion raised that the day of revelation was yet to come.

Chiefly however it is at the end of the book of Deu-

^a Levit. xx. 1-5.

^b Numb. xv. 30, 31.

^c "R. Eliezer Ben R. Josi said : In this matter I accused the scribes of the Samaritans of falsehood, while they say that the resurrection of the dead cannot be proved out of the Law. I told them, You corrupt your Law ; and it is nothing which you carry about in your hands ; for you say that the resurrection of the dead is not in the Law, which saith, That soul shall be utterly cut off : his iniquity is upon him,—shall be cut off, namely in this world.—His iniquity is upon him.—When?—Is it not in the world to come?"

The charge here brought against the Samaritans, of corruption, was simply that their interpretation was not orthodox. See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt. xxii. 32.

For Warburton's bitter refutation of this interpretation of the other passage noticed above, see Divine Legation, book vi. sect. 3.

teronomy, where we find this necessary implication of another life. Throughout the book, the Lawgiver had declared with sufficient minuteness what was the covenant made with the nation, and what its temporal sanctions. He had also explained what crimes the civil magistrate was to visit; and in some of these, which might escape legal detection, a mysterious threat was held out that they should not eventually go unpunished. But foreseeing that some one might indulge in the hope, that if he did not commit these few crimes, and could escape human vengeance, his own share of the national blessing would come to him, and that consequently there were some individual sins which he might commit with impunity, the Lawgiver provides against such a hope by threatening *other* punishments.

In the 28th chapter had been described the consequences to the nation collectively, of observing or of violating the Covenant. The blessings for obedience being, that the nation should inherit the land of Canaan, and that it should be fruitful. The curses for disobedience, that the land should be barren, and that the people should be driven from it. And here the nation is addressed in the singular number, because the blessings and the curses were strictly of a national character.

Then^a Moses speaks to the people as a number of individuals, changing from the singular to the plural number; and he urges them, as individuals, to make up their share of the national obedience. But lest any one selfishly inclined, should think that his individual trans-

^a Deut. xxix. 2.

gression, if safe from the civil magistrate, could not affect himself, so long as the nation obeyed, Moses introduces parenthetically^a a stronger inducement to individual obedience, to the effect that, even if such a transgression should escape the curses *hitherto* denounced, God had still other curses in reserve. "Lest," he says, "when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of my heart, to add drunkenness to thirst (that is, to gratify the cravings of my vicious appetites); the Lord will not spare him, but then the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall *lie upon him*, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under Heaven. And the Lord shall *separate him unto evil* out of all the tribes of Israel, according to all the curses of the Covenant that are written in this book of the Law^b."

Now when it is observed that this man is supposed to indulge in the hope of impunity, after he has heard and understood the words of the Covenant, must it not have been that he found the actual curses not applicable to his particular case? And as the Lawgiver clearly intends to take this hope, shrewd as it was, from him, he must be understood to declare that, admitting no provision yet made in the Law for his sin, yet still God would not spare him.

^a Deut. xxix. from verse 18 to verse 21.

^b The expressions *lie upon him*, and *separate him from evil*, are respectively equivalent to *his iniquity shall be upon him*, and *he shall be cut off*, at Numb. xv. 30, 31.

Unless we are disposed to acquiesce in the extravagant opinion, that Moses threatened a miraculous temporal death against every vicious person^a; unless we think it probable the threat meant, that the land should become desolate for every individual sin; if moreover men found then, as assuredly they did find, that moral sins were not always punished at all; then every man who believed these words to be divinely inspired, must have certainly expected a future state of retribution.

And here we must stop. We cannot venture to say what details were connected with the belief. We only know that it was entirely disconnected from the Mosaic revelation, but was probably inculcated by all the teachers of the land.

God made no revelation then concerning this doctrine; the Mosaic books were purposely reserved and even silent on the subject; or else the end of this Temporal Covenant would not have been effected; the moral inducement to look after something better; the expectation of a New Covenant. We have seen that this revelation was so constructed as, by not meeting individual moral transgressions at all, but yet establishing that God was watchful, to render quite certain the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, in the mind of every pious Israelite, who not only believed in the divine origin of

^a And yet Dean Graves says (Pentateuch, part iii. Lecture iii. sect. 1), "That these curses were of a temporal nature is undeniable. They were, with regard to the individual, to be of the same kind as those which were to be inflicted on the nation." These curses were, that the whole land should be brimstone, and salt, and burning; that it should not be sown, nor bear, &c.

his Law, but was content to study God in an imperfect religion ; and not to refuse submission because God did not reveal all truth to him, and remove all possibility of moral probation and discipline, by forcing Himself upon the vicious or the careless.

These men, without much doubt, the profligate and the worldling, may either have denied or neglected a doctrine which interfered with their unhallowed pursuits ; but the doctrine marked, at least in its practical bearing, who was the friend of God, and was unquestionably the consolation of all who ever saw the wicked in prosperity.

I cannot quite understand the difficulty that is made about this doctrine being handed down by tradition. Zealous Protestants are afraid of thereby countenancing the absurd claims of the Talmudical Jews, or the Tridentine Christians ; but let it be remembered that unless we are misled by the mere name, we object to these traditions, not because they were unwritten, but because they are errors.

It is one thing to pretend that God gave an oral law to Moses, which contains within itself marks of its falsehood, or that a self-constituted body of legislators assert, without proof, a divine commission ; and another to assume, that a doctrine, no mere dogma, but a necessary deduction from all natural or revealed religion, must have been known to those who were in the condition of the Covenant people. And although we may wonder why God left this doctrine to an uncertain human teaching, I do not see that the wonder will be removed if it had not even this support. If we once acknowledge that

God purposely abstained from revealing this doctrine in the Mosaic revelation, and yet must arrive at the conclusion that the doctrine was well known, we immediately suspect that it was one relic of the patriarchal religion, everywhere decaying and disappearing, not interfered with by Moses (as St. Paul argues^a), and restored by Christ.

The pious Israelite could perceive, with sufficient clearness, the necessary truth, that some should awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And though irreligious men might doubt, or even deny, they did but doubt and deny what infidels still misunderstand.

^a Gal. iii. 17.

CHAPTER V.

THE FAITH OF ISRAEL.

IF then the Covenant made with Israel was only national, and therefore temporal, it follows that an individual Israelite had really very little to do with it, and scarcely anything to hope from it. The pious and the wicked were all equally concerned; and if there were nothing else, that is, if there were no individual religion, men must have been often wicked with impunity, and righteous with no prospect of reward.

It was this thought that led us, in the last chapter, to the conclusion, that a pious member of the theocracy must have had regard to a future life. From the very nature of the covenant itself, and from the designed separation of it from all mention of eternal sanctions, no one could doubt that the Mosaic Law was never intended to help men on to everlasting life, further than in the typical or suggestive way we have considered. I shall, in a succeeding chapter, point out that the quarrel between the Christian and the Rabbinical Jews turned entirely upon this question; and I shall endeavour to explain the causes which led to the extraordinary misunderstanding about what appears so plain. In the mean time, even before those reasons are taken into account, every testimony from the Pentateuch, fairly reflected on, establishes beyond all possibility of doubt, that the old

Covenant, the Law (apart from the civil statutes), the temple service, with its federal sacrifices, must have been of little immediate interest to the bulk of the people.

The Levitical rites, and the whole legal service of the Priesthood, were fixed to the tabernacle and the temple. Except on great days, now and then, or on the presentation of a sin offering, the Israelites had nothing to do with that service. Even those who came up to worship were present rather as spectators than as assistants; the worship would have been complete without them. And what is very remarkable, the chief, if not the only, connection between an Israelite and the temple service, where he was *individually* concerned, was on the occasion of making a sin offering, which represented him as excluded from that service. The temple, properly so called, was entered only by the tribe of Levi. Our Lord Himself was never inside it. And even the Levites, who alone assisted the priests in the Israelite worship, were present in the temple not more than two weeks out of the whole year*. So that our former assertion, that Judaism was altogether national, is borne out by the consideration that, as individuals, the mere Israelites were scarcely concerned with the ordained Levitical religion.

Now this singular feature in Judaism is never made of sufficient importance. It usually does not enter into the systems compiled by dogmatic theologians: it affords, as we shall hereafter see, the clue to a great deal of otherwise inexplicable conduct in the Jewish Christians; while, at the same time, it immediately suggests a suspi-

* 1 Chron. xxiv.; and Lightfoot, Temple Service, chap. 7.

cion that the Israelites must have had some other worship besides the Levitical ordinances.

Why it has been ordered that the books of Moses are silent on this point ; why even the devotional books give us no clear accounts, is of course a very great difficulty. Nor will this difficulty be completely solved, as the similar one respecting a future life was, by supposing God's design to be to lead thoughtful men on, without a revelation, to arrive at what the careless did not see. Because the question is not of a doctrine, but of a worship ; and we do not quite understand, as we did before, what end would have been answered by the silence. And yet, wonder as we may, the facts of the case are unchanged. We must rest satisfied with the knowledge, that in making the national Covenant, there was an intentional reserve respecting anything else. Even the historical books, which referred to that Covenant, omit any detailed mention of a spiritual religion, although it is certain they must have been written when the Psalms and Isaiah had proclaimed something else than outward service. And this fact, however strange it be considered, ought no more to induce the thought, that the contemporaries of those historical books were not acquainted with a personal religion, than the entire omission of the name of God in the book of Esther would lead any one to believe that Mordecai or his friends did not know of His existence.

But, without pretending to give a positive solution of the difficulty, that there is a designed reserve in the Federal Books of aught save the Covenant ; yet some

considerations will show, not only the incongruity of supposing an Israelite to have nothing else to look to, but the very high probability, grounded on some properly understood passages, that he actually had something else.

It must be borne in mind that, as we have seen, the Levitical worship provided scarce any religion for an individual. To which must be added, that even this scanty service was wanting to all the extra-Levitical men, to the patriarchs of the nation, who died in the faith; that during the Babylonish captivity, two generations of men, some it may be like Daniel and Ezekiel, were deprived of all this worship; and that pious subjects of the ten tribes, Elijah even, could at no time have sacrificed at Jerusalem.

Then, besides, there is something in the very silence of some parts which strengthens this probability. For when once we begin to perceive an *intentional* reserve, and suspect moreover the design of inducing, not of commanding, a spiritual faith, then every ordinance, which left a vacancy for something besides Judaism, looks very like a permission, and even a hint, of a personal religion. For example: the Levites were expressly ordained for the service of the Temple, and yet the actual time occupied in that service was, on account of their number, very limited. By reason of their state allowance, they must have had leisure to attend to many other religious duties; but nothing was commanded them. Here then was given not merely an opportunity, but an intelligible intimation, that the Levite should have employed his leisure

in advancing the cause of religion. And indeed the dispersion of the tribe pretty equally over the whole country seems to have been for the purpose of affording them such an opportunity^a.

And although this consideration only gives a presumption, yet several such presumptions make up a probability. Here then is another and a stronger one. The sabbath was ordained to be kept holy only by a cessation from work. The smallest infringement of this law was visited with the severest penalties; but no command whatever was given for individual worship: so far as the mere letter of the Law went, an Israelite (not a Levite) might have slept through the whole day and been entirely blameless. We cannot however suppose it to have been intended that men should pass the day with no religion: the Mosaic service was not possible away from the sanctuary; and if any worship whatever were expected, which seems to me almost a matter of certainty, it must have been non-Levitical; more like the personal worship of the Synagogues of a future age.

These things afford only a proof that *opportunity* for some non-Levitical religion was offered, although nothing was said about such religion itself. But that a worship of a very great extent was in existence, quite separate from the Mosaic institutions, and in all probability derived from the patriarchal service, is put beyond all doubt, to my own mind, by the positive knowledge that Moses preserved one most important ordinance, which can be shown to have been the usual service of extra-Levitical men; to have been, by its very nature, entirely

^a Numbers xxxv.

disconnected from any federal rites ; to have been permitted to Gentiles and Israelites equally ; and not necessarily to have required the presence of a priest, or to have been offered at the sanctuary.

The ordinance alluded to is the burnt offering or Holocaust, of which I purposely omitted all mention in the second chapter, because I was then speaking only of what belonged to the Mosaic Covenant ; and it will presently appear that the burnt offering was quite independent of it, both in meaning and in institution.

It has always indeed been usual to represent the burnt offering as different from the other sacrifices. Both Jews and Christians have constantly been haunted by an obscure notion that the Holocaust meant something more awful and esoteric than the sin or the peace offerings. If we make proper allowance for the Jews' prejudice in not seeing anything extra-Levitical in the Bible, and for some Rabbinical vagaries, their writings about sacrifices will in general be found much more valuable than anything which the great host of orthodox Christian commentators have ever produced, if we except indeed those who have professedly studied the Jewish annotators. Abarbanel, for instance, speaks obscurely of the burnt offering having regard to the immortality of the soul, and to general moral delinquency ; and intimates that by it the offerer confessed that the victim was slain instead of him, and that its blood was sprinkled on the altar where it was right that his blood and life should be poured out^a. He

^a Exord. in Levit. cap. 4. I have quoted from Abarbanel ; but I believe most Jewish writers adopt the same views. See Maimonides de Sacrificiis, Tractatus 4tus.

supposes that for a wilful act of sin, no expiation was found ; that the sin offering made atonement for "acts of imprudence ;" while he is led into the most strange account of what acts of imprudence meant. In fact, he is embarrassed by an endeavour to square his own system, that the one sacrifice regarded the affections, the other the actions, with the known declaration in the Law, that for a wilful individual transgression the sin offering made no atonement. He did not dare to make the true conclusion, that the sin offering was independent of moral guilt altogether ; and that whatever moral atonement there was, the Mosaic Law had nothing to do with it ; because the Nazarene heresy was founded upon the assumption, that there *was* something besides the Law for a Jew to believe in.

At the same time, if we are careful to take into account this fear of the Jews, their explanation of sacrifices is worth attention, because they know all the facts for a proper system ; but their prepossessions prevent them from collecting and arranging these facts, as we, who happily are free from those prejudices, can do.

It happens also, unfortunately, that the most sagacious of Christian interpreters, who have had the help of the Rabbinical learning, have also had some favourite theories to support ; or, what is worse, some sectarian theology to vindicate ; and they also in many cases have been blind to the true distinction between the sacrifices. Mede corroborates the Jewish notion, when he says that the Holocausts were for sins of our hearts, thoughts and

affections; the sin and trespass offerings for external offences^a. Even the narrow-minded Dutch Calvinists saw something of the same kind^b. But no one seems to have understood that, while the federal sacrifices had reference only to legal sins, the burnt offering, regarding moral transgressions, had properly no connection at all with the Mosaic institutions, although Moses ordained some particular customs to be observed with it. Let us therefore consider some of the most important circumstances in this kind of sacrifice.

1st. The burnt offering was *wholly consumed*: no part was eaten either by the priest or by the worshiper. This distinguishing feature entirely removes all idea of a covenant feast. And yet those writers who are eager after the favourite theory of a federal origin of all sacrifices, adopt some curious expedients for explaining away this stubborn fact.

The two chief advocates of this doctrine, Mede and Cudworth, whose great learning and good sense are entitled to the deepest respect, were not free from the common error of learned men, *the error of system*, or the straining of everything to conform to their theory. They contend that a feast was implied in the burnt offering, because it was always accompanied either by a meat or a peace offering^c. This assertion is not however supported by sufficient evidence. For although in several passages, instanced by Mede, the Holocaust was sacri-

^a Book i. Discourse 49.

^b Witsii Œcon. Fœd. iii. 3. 22.

^c Mede, Works, book ii. chap. 7; Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, chap. 1.

ficed along with the meat offering^a, yet other passages can be adduced where no such accompaniment is mentioned^b. And even if it were granted that the two offerings generally or even always went together, yet there is no proof that the offerer ate any part even of the meat offering; and if he did not, there is still wanting *the eating together* to constitute a federal feast. But moreover it is plain that the burnt offering and the meat offering were regarded, not as two parts of the same sacrifice, but as two different sacrifices often made together. In the first part of Leviticus, the burnt offering is described and concluded, before anything is said of the meat offering. There is no more reason to conclude that the meat offering was a necessary part of the Holocaust, because they were generally sacrificed together, than to infer that the sin offering was a part of the same, because frequently accompanied by it.

But these writers, in order to carry out the notion of a federal feast, also contend that with the burnt offering was associated the peace offering, where of course there was an *eating together*^c. But this assertion is not true. Where was the peace offering in the daily morning and evening burnt sacrifice? How could the extra-Levitical Holocausts have had such an accompaniment? The burnt offering was so clearly of a different nature to the other sacrifices, that any attempt to class it in the same system with them can only lead to confusion. It is always

^a Lev. xxiii. 12, 13, 18; Numb. viii. 8; xv. 4, 5; xxviii. 20, 28, 31; xxix. 6, 11, 19; Nehem. x. 33.

^b Lev. xvi. 3, 5; xii. 6; 1 Sam. vii. 9, &c.

^c Mede and Cudworth, as above.

spoken of as different. None of them can be said to constitute a part of the burnt offering, although so frequently associated with it.

2ndly. Nor can the burnt offering be regarded in the light of a sacrificial gift. The idea of a sacrificial gift is of something to support the service of religion; and all those offerings which were of this nature went either to adorn the sanctuary, or to support the priests and Levites. Nothing of this nature can be discovered in the burnt offering, which was all consumed^a.

So that we must seek some other meaning than that of a federal feast, or of a sacrificial gift.

3rdly. The burnt offering was not confined to the people in covenant. The patriarchs, before the covenant was made at Sinai, offered burnt offerings, but never sin or peace offerings: of this fact there ought to be no doubt^b. Moreover, even during the existence of that covenant, the sacrifices of non-Israelites were always burnt offerings^c. Job, an excellent type of devout Gentiles, offered *only* burnt offerings^d. And it seems to have been a constant custom to allow Gentiles to offer up a Holocaust; in strict accordance, no doubt, with the original meaning of the sacrifice. "The Jews believe it to have been peculiar to burnt offerings, that they might lawfully be offered at the temple of Jerusalem by strangers as well as by Israelites. This, they contend, was not the

^a This position is not affected by the circumstance that when quadrupeds were offered, and a priest performed the ceremony, he took the skin for his fee (Lev. vii. 8).

^b See Chap. II. at page 44, note ^b.

^c Numb. xxiii.

^d Job i. 5; xlii. 8.

case with other sacrifices, none of which could be accepted by the Jewish priests from any Gentiles: not piacular victims, properly so called, whether sin offerings or trespass offerings, because the laws respecting them were given to the Jews only, and not to other nations: nor peace offerings which used to be offered at the solemn festivals, because strangers had no concern in the festivals prescribed to the Israelites: nor, lastly, to the votive or voluntary peace offerings, because the meat offering that was always to be connected with these oblations was never, they allege, to be accepted from strangers^a. Whence it became customary, that if any piacular victims were brought to the Temple by Gentiles, they were slain and consumed with the ceremonies peculiar to burnt offerings^b."

Again, a very great authority says, "They receive not of the heathen but burnt offerings only; because it is said, From the hand of the son of a stranger ye shall not offer the bread of your God. They receive even burnt offerings of birds from a heathen, yea, though he be an idolater; but they receive not from them peace offerings, nor meat offerings, nor sin offerings, nor trespass offerings^c." In case a heathen brought a peace offering, either it was offered as a Holocaust, or was to be considered as a peace offering made by Israel, not by the heathen.

The fact that foreigners were permitted to offer some kind of sacrifice, is corroborated by the Book of Maccabees

^a Lev. xxii. 25.

^b Outram on Sacrifice, Disc. i. chap. 10. He quotes from Maimonides in *Maase Korban*, c. 3.

^c Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, viii. 4; who also quotes from Maimonides.

and by Josephus^a. It will not be doubted that the oblations mentioned in these places (if *zebachim*) must have been whole burnt offerings; because it is evident that no uncircumcised person could offer the other sacrifices.

And it is a thing of no small importance, that the Holocaust, unlike the federal offerings, was not necessarily confined to the sacred nation.

4thly. The burnt offering was not originally intended to be confined to the sanctuary, or to require the presence of a priest. Not to mention the patriarchal or the Gentile sacrifices, it is to be remarked that, from the entrance into the land of Canaan to the building of the Temple, very frequent reference is made to burnt offerings being presented, away from the tabernacle by men not of the tribe of Levi, and of such being accepted by God. Thus Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh^b, Manoah of the tribe of Dan^c, offered burnt sacrifices; Samuel a Levite but not a priest^d, Saul a Benjamite^e, and David of Judah^f, did so likewise. And although it might appear probable to some that non-Levitical Israelites could also offer peace offerings away from the sanctuary^g (which, however, on the lowest supposition, is not a matter of certainty), yet it

^a 2 Mac. iii. 35; Joseph. Bell. ii. 17. § 3. See also Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Joh. xii. 20; the notes of Maimonides in Tract. Zebachim of the Mishnah; and Beausobre, Introd. on the Subject of the Holy Things.

^b Judges vi. 26.

^c Judges xiii. 15–23.

^d 1 Sam. vii. 9; x. 8.

^e 1 Sam. xiii. 8–12.

^f 1 Sam. xx. 6, 29; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24.

^g The passages where a peace offering is said to have been offered away from the sanctuary are, 1 Sam. xi. 15, by Samuel, and 2 Sam. xxiv. 25, by David, which we will presently consider. In other cases

is beyond doubt that they never offered the sin offering ; and therefore the burnt offering is thus distinguished from the latter, even if it share this distinction with the peace offerings. And when we see how constantly this sacrifice of the Holocaust, between the encampments in the wilderness and the building of the Temple, was performed quite independently of the tabernacle, without a word of excuse, or a hint that there was anything unusual ; we are obliged to understand the command in

there was only a *promise* of a peace offering, which might have been fulfilled at the tabernacle. When Saul at Gilgal (1 Sam. xiii. 9) brought animals for burnt and peace offerings, it is to be remarked that he is only said to have offered the former (verses 9 & 12), and therefore nothing can be proved from this case. But I cannot forbear, in passing, from alluding to the gratuitous supposition that Saul invaded the priest's office in this transaction, and that it was for that he was reprehended by Samuel. I call it gratuitous, because Samuel never speaks of such a thing to Saul. The king's fault was impatience and want of faith. In the burnt offering no priest was at that time required ; and even if there were, Samuel was not a priest.

But it must be confessed that, on the two solemn occasions of the election of a king (1 Sam. xi. 15), and of the transference of the tabernacle worship to Moriah (1 Chron. xxi. 26—xxii. 1), a peace offering seems indeed to have been made. But in the first instance, it was a solemn feast of the whole nation ; and I do not know any reason for deciding that the tabernacle was not there or near. It does not appear to have been stationary ; it was at one time at Shiloh (Josh. xviii. 1) ; then at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 25, 26) ; and then at Shiloh again (1 Sam. i. 9) ; at Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii. 2) ; at Nob (1 Sam. xxi.) ; at Jerusalem (2 Sam. xv. 29) ; at Gibeon (1 Chron. xxi. 29). And when we know that David, in his flight, was accompanied by the ark (2 Sam. xv. 24), it seems very probable that the tabernacle was usually fixed where the ruler resided ; and that Samuel's and Saul's frequent meetings at Gilgal may, after all, have been occasioned by that place being made the temporary capital by the presence of the ark.

But it is expressly said that, when David offered a peace offering,

Leviticus, to bring the burnt offering to the door of the sanctuary^a, as referring only to the time of travelling about the wilderness; and the further command, that after the Israelites left the camp, they should only offer this sacrifice at the place which the Lord should choose^b, could not, of course, be obeyed until the choice was made. This fixing of the Holocausts at the Temple served the design of discountenancing the high places,

the tabernacle was not near. And I would remark, on this sole decided instance of a peace offering being made away from the sanctuary, that it is mentioned as extraordinary; the peculiar circumstances of the case, and the revealed will of God, occasioned a departure from the otherwise constant rule. (1 Chron. xxi. 28, 29.)

I do not here wish to make any account of what struck me, when I saw that the Septuagint (2 Sam. xxiv. 25) joins Solomon with David in the offerings; namely, that the first part of verse 25 may be parenthetical, and refer to the *subsequent* fixing of the sacrifices there. Yet it is certain, from the fuller account given in the Book of Chronicles, that when David perceived the Lord accepted his offering, he understood that this was to be the place which had been intended for fixing the worship, and therefore he may have had less scruple in departing from the usual rule. For my own part, I incline to the belief that the offering the peace offering refers to David's fixing the worship there from that time forward, and, as the Septuagint adds, Solomon's continuing it. But although others may not so understand the passage, yet it is beyond controversy, that the peace offering could never have been *complete*, unless God's portion were offered to Him *at His own dwelling*. It may be that it was allowable, in the private peace offerings, for the worshiper to eat his part there, and afterwards send God's portion to the tabernacle. And, at any rate, as we have seen that the only well-decided instance of making the peace offering away from the tabernacle was at that place where henceforward the peace offerings were to be always made; I see no reason to depart from the above conclusion, that the burnt offering was the only one of the sacrifices which was *by its nature* independent of the sanctuary, that is, of the Levitical worship.

^a Lev. xvii. 8, 9.

^b Deut. xii. 5, 6, 13, 14.

which led to idolatry; and also, as we shall presently see, by causing these sacrifices to cease at last, it served another very important part of Providence. Even after the worship was established at Jerusalem, Elijah offered a burnt sacrifice at Mount Carmel, upon an altar that had been used, before Ahab's apostasy, for such purposes^a; but there is not the slightest allusion to any other kind being ever offered. Still, except in extraordinary cases, the Israelites ought not to have offered them anywhere but at the Temple; and I think it highly probable that so much greater stress is laid upon the fixity of the Holocausts than of peace or sin offerings, because these, by their nature, could not be offered except at God's house; while, had it not been for a positive injunction, the burnt sacrifice might have been offered anywhere^b.

But this injunction, even at a subsequent time, seems to have been understood as applying only to Israelites; at least, the Misnah declares that a Gentile might sacrifice away from the Temple, and be blameless^c.

5thly. There is a very remarkable circumstance connected with this one sacrifice, which shows that it did

^a 1 Kings xviii. 30-38.

^b On this subject, see Outram on Sacrifice, Disc. i. chap. 2. It ought also to be noticed that, in spite of the commandment to bring the Holocausts to the Temple, yet, even under the most pious kings, as Asa and Jehoshaphat, the people continued to offer them in the high places to Jehovah (1 Kings xv. 14, xxii. 43; 2 Chron. xv. 17, &c. Compare 2 Kings xviii. 4 with 2 Kings xviii. 22); and moreover, that although this is spoken of as an offence, yet certainly as a comparatively venial one; much less than the images of Jeroboam, and still less than the false gods of Ahab.

^c Tract. Zebachim.

not make part of the same system with the sin and peace offerings :—That, whereas the two latter *always* went in the same order, so that the one was a sequel to the other, and thus they were connected ; the burnt offering sometimes came before and sometimes after the sin offering^a ; which could not have been the case, if they were parts of the same system. In opposition to this view, Outram, the most sensible of all writers on Sacrifice, from mistaking this separation of offerings, quotes, without comment, from a Jewish authority, that the reason why the particular order was observed at the consecration of the priests was, that the worshiper was not worthy enough to offer the Holocaust until he had first sacrificed the sin offering^b. Now, if this were the reason, I do not see why it ought not also to apply to the offerings of the twelve princes, where the burnt offering was made first. But once admit that one of these sacrifices was Levitical, and the other non-Levitical, and how easy of explanation then is the fact, that no certain order was observed in the making of them together, since they were different services^c !

6thly. The Epistle to the Hebrews, while pointing out the inefficacy of the Levitical sacrifices for procuring moral atonement, makes no mention whatever of burnt offerings (except in the quotation in the tenth chapter

^a Compare Lev. xii. and Numb. vii. with Exod. xxix. ; Lev. ix. ; and Ezek. xliii.

^b Outram De Sac., Disc. i. chap. 5.

^c In adjusting the various evidence adduced above, it seems scarcely necessary to observe that this 5th reason does not apply to any difference between the peace and the burnt offering ; it only establishes that the sin and burnt offerings were not parts of the same service.

from the 40th Psalm); nor even of rams, the animals usually offered as Holocausts*. In declaring the atonement in the Levitical Law inefficacious, it speaks only of the sin offering, or of bullocks and goats, the animals offered in this sacrifice. This very striking fact proves that the author of this Epistle, in contrasting Judaism with Christianity, did not think the burnt offering made a part of the former.

But, did it form a part of Christianity? It certainly did not do so directly. It was never intended to be practised under the Gospel. This is evident from the fact that Providence had rendered this sacrifice impossible. So that although the apostles, and even all enlightened Jews, might perchance have afterwards seen that the Holocaust was a thing passed away; yet all doubt was removed when God had first commanded that the burnt offering should not be offered except at the Temple, and then destroyed that Temple. Nothing could show more plainly that it was God's intention that this, as well as the Levitical sacrifices, should cease. We have been able to account for the cessation of the sin and peace offerings; that is, we can see why God allowed them to be no more offered, when the Covenant, of which they

* See Chap. II. page 61. So little have succeeding Christian writers supposed any meaning in the omission, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of *sheep*, the usual victims in the burnt offering, that Justin Martyr in quoting (it would seem) a passage of the Epistle from memory, instead of "bullocks and goats," has "goats and sheep." (Compare Dialog. cum Tryphone, cap. 13. with Heb. ix. 13.) I do not believe the specification of the animals alone usually constituting the *chattah*, to have been undesigned; and yet Justin saw no difference between the bullock of the sin offering and the ram of the burnt offering.

were the symbols, had terminated. Nothing proves so convincingly that the covenant was of God.

But why did God allow the burnt offering to cease? Why did He issue a positive injunction to confine it to the Temple, when both from its nature and from the common use, it might have been offered elsewhere, and then, by destroying that Temple, put an end to it altogether? The same reasons do not apply here as to the covenant sacrifices. Again, if God accepted this sacrifice before the covenant was made, why does He refuse to accept it now that the covenant is at an end? If it formed the outward service of pious Gentiles, and even the non-Levitical part of an Israelite's worship, what reason can be assigned for its not being now permitted?

If God enjoined on men the burnt offering, and if, as St. Paul says, the covenant with Israel did not interfere with His previous revelations, why, I again ask, should the burnt offering cease when the covenant ceased? The difficulty is not avoided by saying that it arose from men's spontaneous worship; because we should then be embarrassed with the question, why God is not pleased with such a spontaneous worship now, as well as formerly.

And moreover, if this sacrifice made atonement (in the *Jewish* or lesser sense) for moral offences, as the Rabbis and some Christians think, why is not that atonement needed now? It is not any answer to say that it was discontinued by command; there is no such command in existence. God rendered it impossible: but why?

God put an end to the federal sacrifices, when they were no longer required; not for innovation, let us be

sure. And, with the same certainty, we may conclude that God's providence would never have terminated the Holocausts, unless also they were no longer needed.

Now, what event happened at that time, which was not solely dependent on the Old Covenant, and concerned both Jews and Gentiles equally, but the death of Christ? It was that event which separated those who could offer burnt offerings from those who could not; and therefore (I see not how this conclusion can be avoided) the burnt offering had no meaning after that death. Pious Jews, and even the apostles, continued to offer it, till God proved to them, in language stronger than any other kind of revelation, that it had served its end. It had prefigured the Atonement; and was of no further use when the Atonement was accomplished.

This then is the sum of our investigation, the rationale of our facts: that the burnt offering must have pointed forward to the moral atonement to be effected by the Messiah. I do not now concern myself with those proofs adduced by Outram and Magee in support of this assertion; which proofs, however, when we refer them only to this one sacrifice, and not to the sin offering, are unanswerable. I corroborate these proofs by showing, and that with no shadow of a suspicion of mistake, that no other mode can explain why the burnt offering has ceased.

And while thus strengthening the hands of those who truly make the burnt offering a picture, or a rehearsal of the Atonement, let us not rashly conclude anything respecting the details of the Israelite's faith, of which indeed

we know scarce anything positively. But having shown the very high probability (amounting to a certainty in my own mind) that the burnt offering was the type of Christ's atonement, it may be useful also to point out some circumstances in the mention of the Messiah in the earlier part of the Old Testament, which add to this probability.

I stop not to prove that there was from the first an expectation of some Messiah among the patriarchs, handed down by them through the Israelites. For, in answer to the extravagant rationalism of the last hundred years, which would argue against common sense, the profound Hengstenberg has not only successfully defended the Messianic character of the prophecies, but has also made it clear that the prophets were oftentimes not more precise, because they were speaking of what their hearers were already acquainted with^a. His testimony is amply sufficient for the purpose intended. But I think it would serve a good end, if we were able to establish that the ancient belief in the Messiah *could not* be the same as that entertained by the anti-christian Jews; and could not be connected with the Mosaic Law.

First, the idea of a military Saviour could not have been prevalent among the Israelites; for it must have been only when such a deliverer was wanted that he could have been expected. Abraham and the patriarchs, the Israelites when flourishing, had no enemies that such a Saviour could free them from. Of what advantage would have been the belief in such a Saviour to David,

^a Hengstenberg, *Christology*; especially on Isaiah vii. 14.

who himself subdued his enemies? If such were the kind of Messiah thought of, Solomon, in the height of his prosperity, must have suspended his belief altogether; or, it may be, if anxious to carry out God's designs, have wished for adversity, that the promise of a victorious Messiah might not seem altogether impossible. Nay, if there were an universal expectation of such a warrior Christ, it must have had a completion in the person of any one who delivered the nation from pressing difficulties. Joshua, or Samson, or David; or, to come later, the Asmoneans; might justly have been called Christs, if they had done all that the Christ was expected to do. But although some of these deliverers were called Saviours, on account of the temporal deliverance which they effected^a, yet no one imagines that they were ever mistaken for Shilohs. And this is the more remarkable, because afterwards, when the Rabbis expected a *temporal* deliverer, they were easily deceived in this respect, until a constant succession of frightful disasters made them more cautious. If Bar-Cochab, who promised to the Jews deliverance from the Roman servitude, had succeeded in establishing an independent kingdom in Palestine, the Jews, who then were looking only for a temporal prince, would have looked no further. It was not till his defeat and death that the Rabbis^b were satisfied of the false-

^a See Pearson on the Creed, 2nd Article.

^b It must be observed that this Bar-Cochab was followed, not only by the populace, who would follow any one, but by the chief men of the nation, whose views must have been more extensive. The most celebrated of the doctors of that age, Rabbi Akibah, is said to have joined the impostor with 24,000 disciples. (Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 50; and Lightfoot concerning the Fall of Jerusalem, sect. 5.)

hood of his pretensions. And even now, if any circumcised politician were to do as Zerubbabel did, restore the people to their land and law, and could besides raise them into a powerful empire, few modern Jews could or would question his claim to be the Messiah. Why then, if anciently their expectation had been of the same temporal Messiah, did not the contemporaries of Joshua or of Judas Maccabeus hail them as such?

Connected with this idea of a warrior Messiah, is another article of belief, which bears upon it the plain mark of being introduced subsequently to the dispersion by the Romans. This belief is, that the Messiah will enable them to perform the Law. It is evident that the rise of this idea must have been at a time when the performance of the Law was not possible, and could never have been the constant hope of the prophets between Moses and Ezra, as Maimonides pretends*. It seems beyond dispute, that as the expectation of a warrior prince to deliver them from their political enemies must have arisen after they had lost their independence, that is, at any rate after the extinction of the dynasty of David; so also, the belief in one who would remove the *external* hindrances to the practice of the legal precepts would have been quite unmeaning when those hindrances had no existence.

Even in the days of the New Testament, although an

* "On this account, the whole of Israel, their prophets and wise men, have desired the days of the Messiah, in order that they might obtain relief from those things which do not allow them to apply themselves to the Law and the precepts as they ought, and that they might obtain rest for themselves, and advance in knowledge, so as to obtain the life to come." (Maimonides, *Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 9.)

expectation of a warrior king was in vogue, in consequence of the depressed state of the nation, yet I do not find that any great opposition was made to Jesus for refusing to be made a king. The people were indeed surprised, and his disciples offended, when he preached that his kingdom was not of this world; but it was not because he so preached that the *Rabbis* rejected him, but because He cleared up, what they had confounded together, the Law and the Gospel; because he denounced their orthodox tenet, that the Law gave a right to the kingdom of heaven.

As all the Jewish errors arose from this confusion (which we shall inquire into in the subsequent chapters), of course they connected their Law indissolubly with any hope of Christ. All predictions of the heathen being converted, were supposed to have their accomplishment in the future proselyting of them to Judaism; and even the apostles, for some time after the death of Jesus, seem to have taken for granted that a Gentile must become a Jew before he could become a Christian. It does not seem to have occurred to them that Judaism was not only, by its institution, confined to one people, but that its nature prevented its being observed at any great distance from Jerusalem.

From the popular ignorance of the prophets, they could not easily have seen, what we see, that the most decided accounts of the Messiah are contained in those parts of the old Scriptures where there is least reference made to the Levitical Law; that David and Isaiah and Micah, who speak much of an individual religion and of

the coming deliverer, make but little allusion to the Mosaic institutions; and when they do, they evidently show that they distinguish the covenant with Israel as a separate thing altogether from the Desire of all nations. Whereas, on the other hand, those books which are expressly taken up with the Law and the Covenant, the Pentateuch, and the historical books, make scarcely any express reference to the Saviour; and when they do, it is done in such a way as plainly to intimate that the Shiloh and the Law were disconnected.

In order to make out this last assertion, I will take those predictions of the Messiah in the Levitical books, which are the most evident and the most easily admitted.

1st. There was a double promise made to Abraham, of the Old Covenant, and of that seed in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed. But although these two promises were often mixed up together, yet when the first and the lesser was being solemnly established, no mention whatever was made of the greater^a.

2ndly. In the prophecy of Shiloh, made by the dying Jacob^b, so far from holding out any hope that this person was to bring salvation by means of a civil polity, he manifestly connects the coming of Shiloh with the cessation of that polity. So that either event, the predicted appearance, or the departure of the sceptre from Judah, might naturally suggest the other^c.

^a Gen. xvii. 1-14.

^b Gen. xlix. 10.

^c See Warburton's *Divine Legation*, book v. sect. 3; and Hengstenberg's *Christology* on the passage.

3rdly. In the prediction by Moses of a prophet of equal authority with himself, he not obscurely hints at a change in his laws ; or at any rate that the effects from that prophet's coming should be independent of the effects from the authority of Moses^a.

These are the plainest references to the Messiah contained in the books which are non-evangelical ; and they demonstrate, intelligibly enough, that the good to be expected from the Messiah was disconnected from the national good resulting from the Law.

Now if, as we shall hereafter see, the forgetfulness of this was the grand error which caused the Rabbinical rejection of Jesus ; if it was in the prophets, which were but little known, and of small authority, that the doctrines of Christ and of a spiritual religion were to be found ; we must look, not in the Levitical, but in the evangelical books of the Old Testament for the faith of Israel.

It seems, from various considerations, that the more ancient Jews interpreted the usual and best-known prophecies of the Messiah much in the same way as the Christians do ; in fact, that they were acquainted with the doctrine of a suffering and vicarious Messiah. But when, from various causes, the Jewish doctors were interested in resisting the Christian interpretation, they changed altogether their exegesis of the most celebrated predictions^b. It is not surprising that the Misnah, being the very book which prevented Christianity, should have suppressed the doctrines which the Christians de-

^a Deut. xviii. 15-18.

^b Hengstenberg's *Christology*, chap. 4 ; and on Isaiah liii.

clared. So also the silence of Josephus, about which so great a difficulty is made, is not by any means unaccountable, if we remember that his especial object was to recommend his nation to the Romans. This soldier priest himself knew but little, it may be, of any esoteric faith; and what he did know, he very probably despised. His suppression of Christianity and of all doctrines savouring of Christianity, was only in exact imitation of the plan which his countrymen pursued, of representing the Nazarenes to the Roman authorities as a set of troublesome zealots, disowned by the respectable and influential Jews^a. And if this were his object, it would be much better answered by silence than by anything he could say on the subject; because in a history, he could not state any very flagrant falsehoods, as if he were merely speech-making, like the lawyer Tertullus; whereas his silence implied that he did not recognize Christianity as a part of Judaism.

Moreover, Josephus wrote his history at a time when probably the greater part of the Jews who still retained the ancient faith, had been converted to the Gospel; and almost all who were not Christians had already determined that the spiritual doctrines advanced by the apostles were heresies. He also wrote when the name of Christian was becoming odious to the state; and when any word that showed Christianity to be intimately

^a Acts xvii. 6-8. I think that the silence of Josephus upon Christianity, upon spiritual faith, and upon the Mishnical traditions even, will be fully accounted for, if we read what Tacitus says of the Jews; and understand that Josephus was writing against such reports, and making out a case of special pleading.

connected with Judaism, would have been fatal to his attempt to impress his patrons with an opinion of Jewish virtue.

On the other hand, the writings of the Alexandrian Jews, much better acquainted with the prophets than their brethren of Palestine, give sufficient evidence that the ancient faith was by no means quite extinct, before the light of the Gospel scattered the over-shadowing traditions. Philo, who certainly never saw the Christian writings, speaks a doctrine not much dissimilar from that of Paul^a. The Hellenist book of Wisdom is scarcely less spiritual than the Epistle to the Romans^b.

However, it is in the New Testament chiefly that we look for the ancient faith of Israel, because it is highly probable that all who held any vestige of that faith became Christians. In the preaching of the Apostles to the Jews, it is observable that they never pretended to broach an entirely new religion, but to carry out to its legitimate consequences, what ought always to have distinguished a religious Israelite; and this very important consideration will not only connect, *intelligibly*, the two Covenants together, but will also remove the foundation of most heretical opinions, viz. that Christianity, being novel, must be expected to be unnatural.

Jesus's prophetic office was to restore the Law and the Prophets, that is, to give the true sense to them; and therefore He is to be understood as making an

^a See Magee on the Atonement, Note 33.

^b If Wisdom xiv. 11-30 be accurately compared with Romans i. 18-32, a strong suspicion will arise that the likeness was not altogether accidental.

appeal to those prophecies which taught the same things as He did. At one time, while complaining of the dull comprehension of the majority of His hearers, He contrasts with it the better knowledge of His disciples, who knew what many prophets and righteous men before them had desired to know. Evidently implying that these would have had more correct views of the Gospel than His enemies had^a.

The apostle Paul argues, at great length, in the Epistle to the Romans, that the Christian doctrine of justification by faith might have been deduced even from the Law^b. After having declared that from his Law alone the Jew got no spiritual good, he yet insists that the possession of the Scriptures (the oracles of God) were of very great advantage to him; and that, although so many did not gather the true doctrine (which Paul was upholding) from these oracles, their unbelief did not hinder the faith of those who did^c. He does unquestionably refer to the old Scriptures for his doctrines.

At the same time, we must be careful not to fall into the mistake that the faithful men of old had any very exact notions of the good to be accomplished by the Deliverer, although it is certain that they expected some *spiritual* benefit. The Atonement is constantly called a mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations^d. The disciples had the most vague notions concerning it, until the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. Jesus only obscurely alluded to it. When

^a Matt. x'ii. 13-17.

^b Rom. x. 3-13.

^c Rom. iii. 1-3.

^d Rom. xvi. 25; Col. i. 26.

Nicodemus doubted of the earthly doctrine of regeneration, the Lord intimated to him that he was not yet in a condition to appreciate the heavenly doctrine of the Atonement. It was the enlightenment at Pentecost that made this mystery more clear, as Peter's sermon immediately afterwards testifies*.

And therefore the only conclusion to which we can

* It is a very remarkable phænomenon in modern theology, that the silence, or at least the reserve, in the Prophets, concerning the efficacy of the Legal atonement, should be almost unnoticed. Some, with more enlightened views, conclude that this reserve arose from the ignorance of the Jews concerning the typical nature of their own religion; indeed that the prophets did not know the way of salvation. "From the typical institution of piacular sacrifices, pointing to the great propitiation, it has been confidently concluded that in them believers distinctly recognized the mystery of atonement by the blood of Christ. But, supposing such to have been the fact, how shall we account for that doctrine occupying so small a portion of the succeeding prophecies; or, for its so completely vanishing from the national creed, that the crucifixion of Christ afterwards became a stumbling-block to the Jews?" (Robert Hall's Essay on the Essential Difference betwixt Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John.) The difficulty is easily accounted for, by the supposition that the Legal piacular sacrifices were not connected, by the prophets, *at all* with salvation; and that modern theologians consider Christianity as more complex than the prophets did.—The contemporaries of our Lord, of course, were in error.

The following remarks, from the above-quoted author, are as true as they are beautiful:—"The cross, considered as the meritorious basis of acceptance, the only real satisfaction for sin, is the centre around which all the purposes of mercy to fallen man have continued to revolve. Fixed and determined in the counsel of God, it operated as the grand consideration in the Divine mind, on which salvation was awarded to penitent believers in the earliest ages, as it will continue to operate in the same manner to the latest boundaries of time. Hence it is manifest that this great transaction could admit of no substitute." (*Ibid.*)

safely come is this: There was current among all religious people, before the Gospel, a belief in some great spiritual good to be effected by the Messiah; no one knew exactly how, except that it was something to be superadded to the Law; something which was high above the institutions of Moses, although foreshadowed and introduced by those institutions. To some more favoured men, a rehearsal may have been made of the mystery^a. The burnt offering, the only authorized non-Levitical rite, was intended to typify the Atonement, which was also understood to be non-Levitical. The later Jews confused the Levitical with the non-Levitical; and even the most pious did not quite understand the distinction. The Gospel cleared up all doubts, and gave the key to the forgotten prophecies. But even now, we must not foolishly and impiously imagine ourselves capable of giving an exact explanation of the Atonement. *We* know that the Atonement has been effected by Christ's death; whereas, formerly, men were only promised that some reconciliation should be made by the Messiah, while their views of the *mode* were more or less vague; at any rate they wanted the assurance, which we possess, that we are welcome before the Father, because He has *already* been reconciled. We have a clearer indication of the way; a greater moral inducement to start forth upon it; but the way itself is in no respect changed. Whatever we do or feel which is called righteousness,

^a So Bishop Warburton connects the vision which Jesus said that Abraham had of Him, with the receiving of Isaac in a figure, by the substitution of the burnt offering.

there ought not to be the smallest doubt that the same life and feelings have ever been righteousness, in all ages and over the whole world.

And, in conclusion, let us not fail to remember, that the Jews, in spite of their confusion with the Law, have ever kept sight of the truth, that the expectation of the Messiah was in some way or another linked with a resurrection from the dead. Indeed, they must of necessity have done so, if they hoped for any individual good from Shiloh. For, if the Deliverer came when their bodies were rotten in the tomb, and if they were not to rise again, what interest would they take in the matter? Now, putting aside the absurd stories of the Talmud about all Israelites rising up and partaking in the good things of Messiah's kingdom; this I insist on, that these very absurdities must have arisen from the evident necessity, as well as the constant tradition, that both doctrines were intimately connected together.

And the use I wish to be made of this important conclusion is this. Whatever force there is in the indirect arguments for separately establishing the two doctrines, of a Messiah, and of the resurrection from the dead, this force is increased when we know, that by the close connection of the two doctrines, every argument for the one tends also to establish the other.

Even Bishop Warburton himself perceives this connection, although, beginning at the wrong end, he argues that "if the Jews had the knowledge or belief of a future state of rewards and punishments, they must have had the knowledge of the redemption of man by the death

and sufferings of Christ likewise^a." He seems not to have noticed the fact that, when Paul was charged with being a Christian, he joined together the doctrine of the resurrection and the old prophecies concerning Christ in such a manner, as plainly to evince that he considered the belief in a future state, much the same as the belief in such a Christ as he was preaching^b.

This connection indeed points out clearly enough that the good to be expected by Israelites from their Messiah was in substance, though not in extent, the same as the good we believe that we have obtained. Their faith was veiled, but it still existed. The general outline, though not the exact form, was visible under the covering. And when Christ burst from the tomb, the veil dropped off. The faith was not a new creation, but a brighter manifestation. The better thing was provided, towards which the holy men of old had gazed; and they, with their dimly-revealed hope of Christ's satisfaction, awaited the perfection unto which we have attained.

^a Divine Legation, book v. sect. 6. See also sect. 4 of the same book.

^b Acts xxiii. 6; xxiv. 21; xxvi. 6, 7, 22, 23.

CHAPTER VI.

RABBINICAL ERRORS.

It strikes many persons with surprise that the main arguments, by which the Gospel was first supported, seemed to be drawn from the same sacred books as the most bitter opponents of Christianity venerated, even to superstition. But this surprise will entirely vanish when we come to learn that, although the Word was preserved and almost worshiped, the doctors had disabled themselves from seeing in it the truths which we see. They knew the Scriptures, but had lost the key to them; and the language in which they were written, was to all intents a dead language to them, notwithstanding their acquaintance with its grammatical structure, their complicated systems of conjugations, accents, and vowel points. Their loss of the proper interpretation was owing to many causes, which we will endeavour to trace. And a correct understanding of this matter is so far essential, that we cannot rightly appreciate the prophetic character of Jesus, unless we know who were the men He reprobated, and what were the errors He censured.

When we consider that four hundred years had elapsed between Malachi and John Baptist, that is, between one revelation and the other, during which period the Jewish people had passed through many fortunes; connected at one time with the Persian, then with two of the Mace-

donian monarchies ; receiving customs and doctrines from all their masters ; then, having been politically crushed by the Seleucidæ, and having for a time lost their national religion ; rousing themselves for a short-lived independence, to the celebration of a worship, reformed by fallible and indeed error-stricken men ;—can we wonder that the Jewish church appears so different from what Jesus taught it should be ?

The Old Testament leaves the nation a peaceful dependence of the Persian empire ; the New Testament exhibits it a disaffected province of Rome. No longer the same people in aught save descent ; with a new language, new customs, new teachers ; and, in practice, a new religion. Indeed the fact that the people changed their language during these four hundred years, is the surest proof that they had changed nearly all besides ; the mother-tongue being the last possession a people ever parts with^a.

The original cause, which came into operation after the Babylonish captivity, and which produced the strange misunderstanding about the native religion, was one which is not often suspected, and is yet of a kind most usually pernicious : *an anxious desire to avoid one extreme of error drove them into the other extreme.*

^a I assume upon Vitranga's authority (De Synag. Vet. lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 12), that the ancient Hebrew language was not lost during the captivity, but that it gradually fell into disuse, and did not entirely cease to be vernacular till the oppression by Antiochus. Any other assumption will not, however, affect the argument. And I take this opportunity of stating, that although, for the sake of uniformity, I generally follow Vitranga, yet I do not ground any important argument upon what he says, if other learned men disagree with him.

We have seen that the nation met with all its calamities, because it had neglected the national Covenant. The plaintive Jeremiah, and the stern Ezekiel, had taught their countrymen that these evils had overtaken them in consequence of their ignorance of that Book, wherein God had said, "If you reject me, I will drive you from the land; and the nearer approaches you make to that absolute rejection, the more miserable shall you be." Every thoughtful mind clearly perceived that, when at length the nation openly refused to acknowledge the unity of Jehovah, the king of Babylon had been permitted to dispossess them of their territories; and that, as soon as they returned to Him, the Persian monarch was raised up, to dissipate the might of the Chaldees, and restore Judah to his heritage.

The wise men, who led the national restoration, were duly impressed with the need of preventing a return to the old crime of strange gods. And the system they adopted was of all others the most likely to carry out their purpose. The Book of the Covenant, which we call the Pentateuch, and the Jews the Law, contains an account of the compact between Jehovah and Israel; and gives directions what the people were to do, in order to secure to themselves and their children quiet possession of Canaan. Nehemiah and Ezra, therefore, completed their reformation, by causing the Book of the Law to be read before the people^a, and by urging them, henceforth, to commence a stricter compliance with its requisitions. They at once obeyed, by keeping the feast of Tabernacles,

^a Nehem. viii.

not only because that was one of the ordinances, but because it was an established mode of paying homage to the Lord of the Land, in consideration of their feudal tenure of it^a. And in order that the terms of the Covenant, and the causes of its violation, might be deeply impressed upon the national mind, the Levites were enjoined to explain why the people had been afflicted, and why they were now restored^b.

Here then we see that the reformers wisely taught the Law, above everything else ; for it was the Law that had been forgotten. This safeguard against idolatry proved entirely effectual. The Jews were never afterwards tempted into polytheism. But there is no reason to conclude that those who made the Law so prominent, ever looked to it for eternal sanctions. Not only are the books of Nehemiah and Ezra silent upon the subjects of spiritual religion or a future life ; but there is no doubt that in these, as in the books of Moses, the silence was intentional ; in order, namely, to give no countenance to the very mistake which the later Jews fell into, of forgetting why the Law was so much insisted on, and of giving to it the same pre-eminence, when the tenure of the Land was no longer concerned. And thus, while the former errors were caused by forgetfulness of the Law, the later were due to their not thinking of anything else.

Every one who is conversant with the rites of the Jewish synagogue, is well-aware of the great stress laid upon the lesson out of the Law. But few seem to know

^a Nehem. viii. 13-18.

^b Nehem. ix.

that the service was so contrived, that while the whole ritual referred to the Law, nothing besides was ever taught at all.

The order of the service was indeed, in many respects, similar to our church service; consisting of a liturgy, of two lessons, one from the Law and one from the Prophets; in most cases followed by a sermon. But the Law only was thoroughly read; perhaps in accordance with Ezra's institution. No other part of the Scriptures was treated with the same superstitious veneration.

The Pentateuch was divided into fifty-three or fifty-four sections; one of which was read every sabbath morning, so as to complete the volume in the course of the year, commencing at the first verse of Genesis on the sabbath next succeeding the feast of Tabernacles; when Ezra instituted the service. And when it is remembered that each of these sections comprehended about four of our chapters; that the reading was considerably delayed, by requiring seven readers, each of whom had to go and take his predecessor's place, before he began; and that latterly the reader was interrupted by the interpreter at every verse;—it is plain that the first lesson, from the Law, must have occupied a very considerable portion of the whole service. And in order that this lesson should be deeply engraved on the memory, it was rehearsed three times previously. The lesson for any one sabbath morning was read on the preceding sabbath evening, and on the preceding Monday and Thursday^a.

Not only was the first lesson for the day made so pro-

^a Vitringa De Synag. Vet. lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 7, 8 & 9.

minent ; but, in truth, no doctrine not in that first lesson could ever be learned from the Scripture in the synagogue. For although a second lesson out of the Prophets was read, yet only such parts were selected as were thought to illustrate the first^a ; and thus, even if some more spiritual doctrine might be there, it was impossible to detect it, so long as it was explained only by the Law, which spoke not of Christ, or of everlasting life. And it is somewhat remarkable that the selections from the Prophets (called the *Haphtaroth*) were in general such as are not quoted in the New Testament^b. The celebrated 53rd chapter of Isaiah, descriptive of a suffering Christ ; and the passage chosen by Jesus for his sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, beginning “ The Spirit of the Lord is upon me ; ” do not seem to have been publicly read.

In order also, as it would seem, to prevent the people from deriving any spiritual good from even these parts of Scripture, the whole volume of the Prophets was treated with marked disrespect, in comparison with the superstitious regard paid to the roll of the Law. And the reading of this second lesson, such even as it was, was hurried over, and not dwelt upon like the first. The regular portion allotted was twenty-one verses, by only one reader instead of seven ; and interpreted, not verse by verse, but three verses at a time. It was read only on the sabbath morning, instead of being also rehearsed three times previously^c.

^a Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* cap. 16.

^b See Vitringa *De Synag. Vet. lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 11.*

^c Vitringa, *lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 10 & 12.*

On the other holy days, the regular order was interrupted, both lessons being selected, so as to have reference to the particular fast or festival they were celebrating; and as all these high days were essentially connected with the Old Covenant, the lessons also referred to the tenure of the Land, or the Levitical institutions, and not to any spiritual religion.

There is reason to conclude that something like these regulations must have been made by Ezra and Nehemiah, because they were confessedly very ancient^a, and were such as would be naturally called forth by the circumstances of the times. Succeeding generations, anxiously desiring to imitate these arrangements, forgot their altered state, and concluded that the Law occupied the entire synagogue service, because the Law only was to be learned.

Hence it came to pass that men attributed so high a degree of sanctity to the Law, and even spoke slightly of the other parts of the Scriptures. They looked upon the prophets as merely commentators of Moses, and only valuable in as far as they appeared to throw light upon the Law.

It also followed, as a matter of course, that those books of the Scriptures, which could not, by any inge-

^a The commonly received opinion is that the Prophets were not read till after the Maccabean Reform (Prideaux, *Connect. sub annis* 277, 167, 149, B.C.). I have however taken the authority of Vitranga (*lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 11*), who supposes this account, first given by Elias Levita, to be a comparatively modern fiction. But if the common opinion be assumed, that the Prophets were never publicly read at all before the Maccabees, it is clear that my argument is only strengthened.

nuity, be made to refer to the Law, and were therefore most likely to contain a spiritual doctrine, were never read publicly at all; and so came in time to be regarded as of less authority than the other prophets. And as the reading of the Law only caused the more ancient doctors to put the Prophets in a lower grade than the Law, so the reading of such parts only of the Prophets as illustrated the Law, made the more modern distinction of the Megilloth or Hagiographa, as less estimable than the Prophets^a.

The Jewish church must have been sure of error when they neglected Job and Daniel, and forgot everything in Isaiah which was not in Moses^b.

^a The Law or Pentateuch comprehended the five books of Moses.

The Prophets included the historical books (except Chronicles, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah), called the former prophets; with Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, called the latter.

The Hagiographa contained Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Solomon's Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles.

Certainly the division into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, did not *originally* denote any difference of authority between the two latter, since Josephus (Cont. Apion. i. 8) does not even divide the Scriptures in that way.

The modern Jews, mistaking the Synagogue ordinance as founded upon the *authority* of the books, do now speak of the Hagiographa as inferior to the Prophets. There seems to be no reason for the charge brought against them by Christians (who commit precisely the same mistake) of having changed the division.

The distinction, in its origin, was simply this:—1st, the Law; 2ndly, those parts of Scripture which illustrated the Law; 3rdly, the rest of the Book.

^b “Some books of the Hagiographa embraced general or complete arguments, whence detached portions could not so easily be selected as from the Prophets: of which kind are the books of *Proverbs* and

During the two centuries that the Jewish people lived as tributaries of the Persian empire, changes and corruptions were doubtless proceeding by degrees, and without attracting much notice at the time. But the testimony of Malachi proves that they had commenced even in his day. He rebukes the Levites for "causing many to stumble at the Law," and for being "partial in the Law"; or for having improperly explained the meaning of the Law; the guilt of which was mostly attributable to the Levites, because, under ordinary circumstances, those who managed the worship were of their tribe. And there can be no doubt that, during these two hundred years, in consequence of this mode of teaching, the

Job. The five smaller books of *Ecclesiastes*, *Solomon's Song*, *Lamentations*, *Ruth*, and *Esther*, were read through at the several feasts. With regard to the other books of the Hagiographa, I am easily convinced that the books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* were not considered by the Jews to be of the same authority as those other historical books of the Scriptures, which had prophets for their authors. Furthermore, the historical part of *Daniel* had *but little to do with Legal matters*; while the prophetical part is of too sublime an argument for the common people to receive any edification from the reading of it. The two books of *Chronicles* treat of the same subjects as the books of *Kings*, and therefore the reading of them is the less necessary. But the *Psalms*, which by reason of the author and subject, the Jews have always made great account of, and have divided them into five books, like the Mosaic Law, were sung by them in the service of the Synagogue, and the formulæ of prayers and praises were chiefly taken from them; and the reading of them was therefore superseded." (Vitringa, lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 10.)

This is perhaps a very true account. Though it is probable that *Ezra*, *Nehemiah* and *Esther* were not in existence when the original regulations were made.

The reasons for rejecting *Job* and *Daniel* are worthy of a very particular consideration.

notion of all doctrine proper for public edification being deducible from the books of Moses, and the custom of neglecting the Prophets, except when they appeared to illustrate the Law, had obtained such hold upon the public mind, that when the people are again seen in history, on the overthrow of the Persian monarchy, they knew nothing about the Prophets^a; they had lost the key to the Scriptures; and the veil was on their heart when Moses was read.

But the two ancient traditions, of a future life and of a coming Christ, were never lost. The great body of both people and doctors did not hesitate in holding these expectations; while they were unable to perceive the practical consequences to themselves from these hopes, because they had acquired the confirmed habit of looking for them, not in the Prophets and other evangelical parts of the Scripture, where they were to be found, but in the Pentateuch, where the allusions to them are obscure and casual. Forgetting that the books of Moses were intentionally silent concerning anything except the Old Covenant, they left unheeded the spiritual consolation of Job, of Daniel, and of Isaiah.

It was the object of all the teachers of the people to invent artificial rules, whereby they might gather from Moses such doctrines as any natural interpretation would never find in his writings. It was after the reading of the lesson out of the Law that the blessing was pro-

^a "Confessedly the mass of the Jewish people had not much to do with the prophets, but only with the Law." (Tholuck, *Dissertation on the Use of the Old Testament in the New.*)

nounced : "Blessed be thou, O Lord, Ruler of the world, who hast given us the Law, the Law of truth, and hast planted eternal life among us : blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast given us the Law^a." And if the received teaching was, that man must look into the books of Moses, to learn how he might attain eternal life, there can be no wonder that everything went wrong. If it was believed that the Law (the statutes of the magistrate, or the record of the temporal covenant) was the authoritative text-book for showing the road to Heaven ; how devoid of meaning must have appeared the teaching of the Mediator, *I am the way* !

Latterly also, any knowledge beyond the Law, read and interpreted in the synagogues, was not possible to the great body of the people ; since the language in which the Scriptures were written was a dead language, understood by the Rabbis only. And therefore those who were not *disciples of the wise*, could only learn the other sacred books from the teaching of their doctors, who, we shall soon see, taught *error*. We need not here enter upon the discussion whether the ancient Hebrew was not the mother-tongue after the Babylonish captivity ; or whether it *gradually* fell into disuse during the connexion with the Greek monarchies. It would be presumptuous to hazard an opinion where the most learned men differ^b. But it will be sufficient for our purpose to take the lowest supposition, that after the time of Alexander, the Hebrew

^a Vitringa, lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 8.

^b Vitringa, lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 12. Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 277 B.C. Tholuck on the Hebrews, Introduction, chap. 3.

was very little known ; and that under the Asmoneans it was never spoken or thought of by the unlettered. So that, at any rate, for some generations before Christ, the people knew no more of their Scriptures than what were interpreted in the synagogue, or explained by the scholastic preachers.

It might indeed be alleged that, in this respect, they were no worse off than ourselves, who are similarly indebted to the labours of others for our acquaintance with the Bible. But then, whereas we possess excellent translations, and the philological labours of our scholars are under the guidance of common sense ; the Jews had no correct or available translation, until the custom of referring everything to the Law had become inveterate ; and their most erudite interpretations were puerile and ridiculous.

There was indeed a version in the Hellenistic Greek, in existence among those Jews who lived westward of Palestine. But this translation, which we call the Septuagint, was useless to the leading Jews who spoke Aramaic, and who, arrogating the title of Hebrews, affected to despise the Hellenists or the Grecians, who spoke Greek and read the Septuagint^a. And even this version does not seem to have been used except for private reference ; so that the unlearned multitude knew it not, or at any rate had been already taught a fanciful interpretation of it.

^a It may be mentioned that the following distinctions in the Acts of the Apostles are supposed probable by most commentators :—

1st. Hebrews (*Ἑβραῖοι*) were those Jews who spoke some dialect of the Hebrew (Acts vi. 1).

At the same time, although this vernacular Bible did not do all the good which a translation effects in modern times, it is evident that those who knew it were far better acquainted with the Scriptures than their Aramaic brethren; that they were much better able to appreciate the Christian arguments; and that Christianity had a far greater success among them. Stephen, who was an Hellenist, as appears not only from his Greek name, but from his being chosen one of the deacons of the Hellenists, had much clearer views of the connection between the Old and the New Covenant than the rest of the Christians at that epoch. And it is worthy of notice, that the only Jews able to hold an argument with Stephen, were the foreigners from Egypt and Asia Minor, who spoke Greek, and were therefore Hellenists^a. So also Paul, although he boasts himself a Hebrew^b, yet was probably brought up among Greeks, and used the Septuagint version; perhaps indeed he owed a great deal of his scriptural knowledge to it. Apollos, an Hellenist, a native of Alexandria, the very birthplace of the Septuagint, was distinguished even among the apostles as a man mighty in the Scriptures^c. And the author of

2nd. Grecians, or Hellenists (*Ἑλληνισταί*), were also Jews who spoke Greek and used the Septuagint version (Acts vi. 1; ix. 29; xi. 20).

3rd. Greeks (*Ἕλληνες*) generally were not Jews, but proselytes of the gate (Acts xiv. 1; xviii. 4; xx. 21; xxi. 28, &c.).

4th. Gentiles (*ἔθνη*) were generally idolaters (Acts xiv. 2; xv. 19).

See, in addition to the authorities in the last note, Vitrिंगa, lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 7; Lightfoot, *Harmony on the Hebrews*; Biscoe on the Acts, chap. 4. § 2.

^a Acts, chap. vi. ^b 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5. ^c Acts xviii. 24.

the Epistle to the Hebrews, with his extraordinary intimacy with every turn in the Old Bible, would appear not only to have used the Greek version, but not to have known the Hebrew^a. And if any additional testimony is required to prove how much better acquainted with God's mind the Grecians were than the Hebrews; let the valuable religion in the Hellenist Book of Wisdom be compared with the follies of the Talmud.

We may therefore easily understand why the preaching of Paul, in the Greek cities, had so much greater success than the preaching of the other apostles, who perhaps strove, in general, to convert the Hebrews only. And this at once gives us the reason why, the Christians being nearly all from either the Hellenist Jews or the Greek proselytes, the New Scriptures were written in a language that could benefit them.

And the want of this version accounts for the almost universal rejection of Christianity by the ignorant Jews of Palestine, who first heard it. For they had no translation of the Bible, which they might "search daily, whether those things were so," as the Hellenists of Berea had; and they had therefore the mere choice whether they would believe the Galilæans Peter and John, or their own Rabbis who told them that Christianity was a heresy. It is indeed true that, from time to time, translations have been made into Chaldee of several parts of Scripture, known by the name of Targums. But if we consider the mode or the time of making them, it will appear that they could not materially help the difficulty.

^a See Tholuck on the Hebrews, Introduction, chap. 1.

1st. The Targum of Onkelos, on the Law, which Dean Prideaux^a praises for being a correct and literal version of the Hebrew, was probably in existence when the New Testament was written ; but it was not required, because the Jews were very well acquainted with the letter of the Law, and were in error because they knew nothing else. 2ndly. The Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets, that is, upon the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, called the former ; and Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor, called the latter prophets. This version Prideaux concludes, from internal evidence, was not made till some time after the other, and was unheard of when Christianity was first preached. And even if we were to take the authority of the Jews, that it was composed in the generation before Jesus ; yet, as it is rather a paraphrase than a translation, and the author takes all kinds of liberties with the text, when it suits his purpose to do so ; and that more frequently in the latter prophets (Isaiah, Micah, &c.) than in the former, that is, the historical books ; it is plain that upon this extreme supposition, this Targum would have been of little or no use in removing errors ;—since, at any rate, it did not come into existence till these errors were too deeply seated to be easily eradicated ; and the author himself explains away any parts that seemed most opposed to them.

Of the Megilloth or Hagiographa, that is, of the books of Job, Daniel, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, &c., com-

^a Connect. sub anno 37 B.C.

prehending some of the least legal parts of Scripture, no Targum was made till long after the Nazarene schism.

The sum of our investigation therefore is this: that the Jews generally were educated in the Law, and knew only such parts of the Scripture as referred to the Law; that those of Palestine, to whom the Gospel was first announced, were in no condition to escape from this single regard to it; that, for any doctrines connected with a coming Christ, or a future state, they were entirely in the hands of their teachers. They had, in fact, no means of objecting to all the preposterous assertions of the Rabbis. And, no doubt, the most prominent and the most frequently conferred gift which the early Christians possessed, that of tongues, was, as Lightfoot^a with very

^a Lightfoot's words on this subject are well worth quoting, especially because, with his usual imitation of Jewish authority, he assumes that the Targum on the Prophets preceded that on the Law; and therefore the conclusion we have arrived at will be agreed to by those who are disposed to take his opinion rather than that of Prideaux.

In Hor. Heb. in 1 Cor. xiv. 2, speaking of the gift of tongues, and of the interpretation thereof, he says: "Now the original text was unknown to the common people; the version of the seventy interpreters was faulty in infinite places; the Targum upon the Prophets was inconstant, and Judaized: the Targum upon the Law was, as yet, none at all: so that it was impossible to discover the mind of God in the holy text, without the immediate gift of the Spirit, imparting perfect and full skill both of the language and of the sense; that so the foundations of faith might be laid from the Scriptures; and the true sense of the Scriptures might be propagated without either error or the comments of men."

"There are many now, learned by study, who are able to translate those tongues into the Corinthian or the Greek, without that extraordinary gift of interpretation, immediately poured out by the Holy

great probability supposes—a miraculous ability to read the Scriptures for themselves in the original; and was one of the great causes why the Rabbinical fantasies disappeared from the Christian preaching.†

But since it is thus evident that the doctrinal errors of the Jews must have arisen from the teaching of the Scribes; that they derived their notions of a spiritual religion, not from the Bible, but from the dogmatic theology of the schools; we must now consider what that theology consisted of.

The public teaching of the people was by means of a lecture or sermon in the synagogue, delivered, it would seem, not by one order of men exclusively, but by any sufficiently learned Jew whom the pastor might choose to appoint. And although, in the first days of the synagogue, a Levite would most probably perform this service, and latterly an ordained Rabbi, yet the general rule was always acknowledged in theory, and sometimes put into practice, that any male Israelite, of age and without defect, might be selected by the ruler of the synagogue to preach to the people^a.

It is the opinion of those best able to decide, that the earlier sermons were only expositions, most usually of the lesson for the day. And we readily perceive that

Ghost. But . . . it sufficed not to the interpretation, to render the bare words into bare words, but to understand the sense and marrow of the prophets' language, and plainly and fully to unfold their mysteries in apt and lively and choice words, according to the mind of God; which the evangelists and apostles, by a Divine skill, do in their writings."

^a Vitranga, lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 6 & 7.

these teachers, impressed with the all-importance of the Law, naturally grounded their instructions upon the Law, or such parts of Scripture as appeared to illustrate it. When they were also required to exhort the people to remember the life to come, or the expected Messiah, they must have exercised no small share of ingenuity in finding these doctrines in the Law; and no one could answer for what would be taught, when the fertile brain of an Oriental was the only groundwork of their divinity. In short, they had to teach two doctrines, of vast importance and lively interest, from a book that scarcely made even a casual allusion to them; and they were, as a matter of course, driven to a mode of allegorical interpretation, instead of expounding Scripture. The text from the Law was only a motto, on which to hang doctrines which Moses never dreamed of. And if it be true, that this allegorical style of sermon did not prevail till at a comparatively recent date^a, when the language was lost; when the education of many ages had rejected everything but the Law; and when the schools were already poisoned with Gentile philosophy; can it be wondered at that the doctrine of the Scribes was so pernicious, as to form the chief burden of the Saviour's discourses that the people should beware of it?

When Christianity first appeared, it was met by two deeply-seated errors in the Jews:—1st, That the blessings of the future life and of the Messiah's kingdom were to be confined to their own nation; and 2ndly, That these blessings were to be secured by the performance of cer-

^a Vitringa, lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 5 & 6.

tain outward actions specified in the Law, or of some of a similar nature appended to it. These two errors were perhaps almost universal ; not limited, like other errors, to particular sects. The apostles themselves were in full activity preaching the kingdom, before they were perfectly free from them. The Rabbis rejected Christ because, *and only because*, He declared that they were errors. Every Judaical false doctrine, opposed by Paul, was a different phase of one or other of these destructive principles. And to the present day the Jews reject Christianity, because Christians believe them to be false.

Now these two prominent and fundamental errors were precisely such as would arise from the peculiar mode of teaching, and the one-sided regard to the Scriptures, which we have considered. In the Law, they found written clearly enough, that the land of Canaan was the heritage only of the circumcision ; that a Gentile, however pious, was, under no circumstances whatever, to have a share in the appointed federal institutions ; that their own nation retained the land, and enjoyed all the blessings promised in the Old Covenant, by *doing* such and such things ; that is, not by inward faith and piety, but by *professing* obedience to Jehovah, by the mere *act* of sacrifice, by keeping feasts and fasts and sabbaths ; that the rules laid down in the Law of Moses had, *literally*, no more regard to a spiritual religion, than an act of parliament has ; and that repentance is not stated to be a necessary part of duty. And then, when from that Law alone they taught a future life ; and when,

neglecting the prophets who inculcated that The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit^a; that The Lord does not delight in the blood of bullocks or of lambs or of goats^b; that He desires mercy more than sacrifice^c; and that He requires man to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God^d; they were forced to interpret the land of Canaan with its blessings, to mean *parabolicè* the kingdom of Heaven with its blessings; what wonder if they concluded that individual repentance and faith were no more the qualifications for one than for the other? And how natural, when they saw that their own nation only was partaker of the Legal Covenant, and that Gentiles, under that aspect, were called unholy, to conclude that in respect of God's eternal favour themselves only were elect! It may have been, perhaps, only a few who were persuaded that the pains of hell had no terrors except for the Gentiles^e; it may have been only some scholastic refiners who told the people that God's threatenings were not intended for Israelites^f; it was probably only the ostentatious Pharisee that thanked God he was not a Gentile^g. And yet these were but legitimate consequences of the universal notion that God knew of no other blessings than those supposed to be promised in the Law to the circumcision. The more liberal indeed allowed to pious strangers some subordinate kind of place in the kingdom of Heaven;

^a Psalm li. 17.

^b Isaiah i. 11.

^c Hosea vi. 6.

^d Micah vi. 8.

^e See Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. 7 & 8.

^f See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Rom. iii. 12.

^g Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 10.

but they were not by any means so consistent as their more rigid brethren, who would utterly exclude from Heaven those who were excluded from the land of Canaan*. And even in the charitable abandonment of principle by some kind-hearted Rabbis, the case of a pious Gentile was only an extraordinary exception to the general rule, that if men would become entitled to God's favour, they must be circumcised and observe the Levitical Law.

We understand therefore that the main error, affecting the whole Jewish people, was that they interpreted the external qualifications and the national rewards, properly belonging to the Old Covenant, as applicable also to the New. And this error was caused by the general ignorance of any part of their Scriptures, except what referred to the Old Covenant exclusively, and contained an account of no other righteousness than an external one, of no other election than a national one. The first of the Christian preachers who disabused their own minds, and tried to disabuse the minds of other Jews, of this gross error, were those who, like Stephen and Paul and Apollos, were already acquainted with the rest of the sacred volume.

And yet there is still a difficulty to be solved. How came it to pass that some of the Jews readily embraced the Gospel, when they found out that the germ of it was in the Old Scriptures; while others, with their modern descendants, so obstinately refuse to listen to it? For

* Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* cap. 3; Maimonides, *Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 3; and the third chapter of this book at page 89.

although the Jew did not know his own Scriptures, yet it seems wonderful that he would refuse to see in them, when explained to him, the principles and lower stages of Christianity. We must seek for the reason of this perversity in doctrinal prejudice; and it will soon appear that the two great sects into which the Jewish theologians were divided, were so constituted, that although they held pretty nearly the same opinions, and knew only the same Scriptures, yet they had not the like professed rules of interpretation. The one party had stereotyped their opinions; the other, even with the same opinions, were not committed to them. They allowed of discussion as to whether they were errors or not; and nothing impeded their giving them up when their falsehood was established.

The body of the Jewish people, for some time before Christ, were separated into two sects: the *textualists*, who admitted no authority as equal to that of the Scriptures; and the *traditionaries*, who were in possession of another revelation (as they pretended), handed down by word of mouth from one age to another; to which was ascribed an authority equal to that of the written word. And these latter were in no condition so much as to argue with those who did not reverence the oral law; because they were previously resolved that nothing was to be received that was not sanctioned by the traditions.

If we were to believe the Traditionary Jews, who now call themselves Rabbanists and Talmudists, and constitute by far the larger portion of the people, this oral law was delivered to Moses by the Lord, at the same

time that the written law was given to him. And we may judge of the kind of evidence by which this assertion is supported, by the following *reason* assigned by one of the defenders of this notion. For since Moses was forty days and forty nights up on Mount Sinai, he could not see to write during the night; and then the oral law was delivered: for indeed he could only discern day from night by the difference between the two laws^a. The account of this oral law goes on to say, that when Moses descended from the mount he called for Aaron, and being endowed with a wonderful memory, spoke out all the oral law to him, exactly as he had received it himself. Then Aaron sat down, and his sons came in, when Moses spoke it a second time. Then entered the seventy elders, who heard it again from his lips. And lastly, the whole people, to whom the lawgiver repeated it a fourth time. Then, Moses having gone out, Aaron did likewise; then his sons; and then the seventy elders. By this means the oral law was deeply impressed upon the memories of them all. It was handed down through Joshua and the succeeding prophets to Ezra the last of them, who delivered it to the great synagogue; by which means it was preserved through successive generations of scribes and rabbis; until at length (no one having thought of this before) it was committed to writing in the second century after Christ, and forms the Mishna, which at present constitutes the chief, if not the only, book to which the Rabbinical Jews pay much attention^b.

^a Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 3.

^b See the preface of Maimonides to the Mishna of Surenhusius, vol. i.; Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 3; Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 446 B.C.; Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. 3.

The probable origin of these traditions is the following :—

We have seen that all those Jewish errors, which were common to the whole nation, were caused by the general ignorance of a great part of Scripture, and the custom of explaining spiritual religion from books, whose purpose was altogether foreign to such a subject. Now it would necessarily happen, that in time, when the popular expositions were of a very allegorical nature, such as would not occur to mere common sense, many preachers would, by the force of their oratory, or their ingenuity, gain a pre-eminence above other doctors; and when they preached anything more than usually extravagant, would obtain the credit of being more than usually sagacious. They would easily gather disciples around them; and these, from the inherent tendency of humanity to imitate, would regard their master's dogmatical teaching as authoritative; especially when that teaching was not of facts, but of fanciful interpretations; because, when once this fancy was admitted to be superior to the plain sense of particular passages, of course the imaginative allegory of an aged, or a learned, or an eloquent, or an influential man, would gain the day against the less startling theories of weaker opponents. And there would be no end to their follies, when the world generally was quite unacquainted with the reasonings of the schools, on account of the disuse of the scholastic language; and the healthful influence, from without, was removed from the theological erudition.

When a renowned teacher had his own school, and taught doctrines *incapable of proof*, and believed in sim-

ply upon his own assertion ; and when his disciples, in their turn, came to be teachers, still retaining an unreasoning regard for the opinions of their late master, and lacking the boldness to rest upon their own word ; unable moreover to find any authority in the Scriptures ; —they were content to recommend their doctrines by the fact that the late Rabbi such an one had said so ; and in this manner the opinions of a learned doctor would become more and more authoritative, as generation succeeded generation. Every one, but slightly conversant with Jewish theology, knows that scarcely anything is advanced without being prefaced by “ Rabbi N. or M. says ; ” and when Jesus taught the people, they noticed how differently He preached, upon his own authority (*I say unto you*), and not as the Scribes.

The inevitable consequence of this hero-worship was such as always results from looking to great preachers, that there came to be a kind of uniformity in the teaching ; and the notions of two or three leading men were eagerly learned by others, and even made into text-books for theological students. So that in the course of a few generations a complete school of traditions was formed, to question which was an unpardonable heresy. It was against these traditions, which made the Word of God of none effect, by virtually prohibiting an appeal to it, that Jesus uttered his denunciations. It was the obstinate adherence to them, which in the days of the Gospel hindered its spread ; as similar traditionary prejudices have ever since prevented the true nature of much of the Bible from being understood.

It is usual, among Christian writers, to accuse the Jews of undervaluing the Scriptures, in comparison with the Traditions. But that accusation, in its bare form, is not true. Indeed the regard which the Jews pay to the Law is an unreasoning superstition, which, I fancy, none of them would be disposed to pay to anything else. And although Jewish authors speak as if they preferred the unwritten to the written word, yet this appears to arise only from the supposed greater clearness, not from any greater authority. Surely the mere fact that the traditions profess to interpret the Law, is sufficient proof that the Law held a place above the words of the Scribes. But inasmuch as they were resolved that the Law should be forced to speak of a spiritual personal religion, which, without the traditions, it confessedly does not, it came to pass that being obliged to adopt some regular, though artificial, mode of interpretation, they consented to regard the traditions as admitting of no doubt or appeal, and to speak slightingly of any interpretation founded on the real grammatical sense of the books of Moses. In all probability the true state of opinion is well expressed in a saying of a certain Rabbi, quoted by Buxtorf^a: "Unless the exposition of the oral law were joined to the written law, the whole of it is obscure, and mere darkness: for, in the first place, the different parts of Scripture contradict and oppose each other; and, secondly, because the written law is imperfect, and does not contain all things necessary to be known."

The expressions derogatory to the Law, collected by

^a Synag. Jud. cap. 3.

many persons^a, are either to be explained in the above way; or they are taken from the Gemara of the Babylon Talmud (a comparatively recent work); or they are the inconsiderate expressions of individual doctors.

The truth is, that the words of the Scribes took the place, not of the Law, but of the Prophets; and even this was not quite professedly the case. The traditionary Jews believed that the authority of the Prophets was no greater than that of the Rabbis; and when it became evident that the Prophets did not, and the Scribes did, expound the Law *spiritually*, it was as a thing of course that the latter were regarded as better exponents of the Law than the former. And exposition of the Law was all that was wanted.

Hence arose the orthodox dictum that "the doctrine and prophecy of Moses contain the sum of all doctrine and prophecy, which were afterwards expounded by the prophets and succeeding doctors more extensively and copiously^b." Hence also Maimonides somewhere says, that if a thousand prophets give one interpretation, and a thousand and one scribes another, the latter is to be preferred.

There is every reason to believe that the greater, or at any rate the more influential, part of the Jewish nation were Traditionaries, in the days of the New Testament. But there was still a large class who would not adopt the pretended oral law, and were therefore called Textu-

^a Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 3; Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 446 B.C.; Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. 3.

^b Vitringa, De Synag. Vet. lib. iii. pars 2. cap. 10.

alists, from their exclusive adherence to the text of Scripture. They had their own doctors and scribes; and although they were imbued with the same errors as the Traditionaries, yet they were not committed to them; they had not the same abject veneration for their wise men as to cause them to cleave to a doctrine when proved to be unscriptural. They did not, probably, know any more of the Scriptures than the other sect; in general they were much less learned; but they alone were open to conviction, and indeed seem to have been convinced; for when once they were satisfied, by the arguments of the Christian preachers, that the prophets had foretold Christianity, and the scribes had obscured these predictions, they were ready to agree to the prophets; instead of assuming, as the Traditionaries did, that wherever the prophets and the scribes were at variance, it was the prophets who were in the wrong.

But the aspect of the Jewish theology will not be sufficiently understood by referring its sects to the holding or the rejecting of tradition. Almost all the public teachers had drunk deeply of Gentile philosophy; which confirmed the state of error in which they found themselves. It is not improbable that it was during their connection with the Persian government that they became acquainted with that seductive philosophy, which rising in the East, encountered Judaism, and subsequently Christianity, in the religion of Persia. This theology, whether we call it Magian or Gnostic; whether we trace it in the tortured Hindu, the light-loving Persian, the insolent Pharisee, or afterwards in the secluded monk,

or the various classes of self-constituted saints,—has always formed the great obstacle to truth, and has ever met the Gospel, in one insidious shape or another, with most fatal success.

The efforts of man to give the reason for evil, joined to the fact that man gets most of his evils through the sway of his senses, led bold theorists to set up two independent principles, one of light, and spirit, and goodness; the other of darkness, of matter, and of evil. Man's sure path was to be in flying from the latter to the former; and in avoiding especially matter and objects of sense, in which the bad god was exhibited. In this extreme form the principle does not do extensive mischief; the frightful resolution of the devotee to show himself superior to matter; the gloomy asceticism of the hermit, reproaching God for having made him one of a social race; or, in the other extreme of the same principle, the immorality of the Gnostic and the Antinomian, who assert themselves free from danger; are limited and exploded by the common sense of mankind. But when this principle was modified by the disciples of Zoroaster into a professed acknowledgement that there was one supreme but passive God; and that the two independent sources of good and evil, Ormuzd and Ahriman, were struggling in the visible world; that the one was bright and beautiful, gentle and good; the other dark and scowling, cruel and revolting;—can we wonder that men were tainted with this poison, even when they thought they were most zealous in cleansing themselves from it? So also it was, when the less gross of the Gnostic

sects represented matter to be essentially bad, and startled the world by their contempt of it, the most orthodox Christians caught the infection, and the most catholic fathers are loud in their praises of fasting and virginity ; while they would have been ashamed of owing this perversion of truth to their Gnostic enemies. And ever since it would not be difficult to show that the impious attempts to separate nature from revelation are, in reality, only other phases of the fallacy, that the natural world is not God's world.

It was with the most attractive of all forms of the Oriental philosophy, the doctrines of Persia as reformed by Zoroaster, that the Jews became acquainted : and although they probably had no intention of becoming disciples of the Zendavest, and would have been eager in combating every species of Gentile religion ; although their own Law, and their own previous discipline, prevented them from carrying away the idea of only a passive supreme being ; yet they carried away a consequence of the idea of two independent principles, namely that man could, by his overt acts, assist or oppose either one of them. And they fell into this notion without perceiving that it tended immediately to overturn all that their own Covenant had established ; the absolute subjection of all powers to Jehovah, and the intimate superintendence He exercises over the good and the bad equally.

This theology, thus doing, what paganism had done, putting aside the Supreme God altogether, represented two powers with the same claims upon mankind, as two

rival candidates for a kingdom, by helping either one of whom against the other, man looked for a reward. The God that men *worshipped* was not supreme over evil; and so the smallest action which was supposed to help him in crushing Ahriman was indeed a meritorious righteousness, like the fealty which a mercenary army might offer to a foreign power; not the natural obedience of a subject to his sovereign, or the unpaid devotion of a child to his parent. And the peculiar danger to the Jew, in this theology, a danger which entirely vanquished him, was that his own Law spoke only of such an external obedience, which he was beginning to apply to a spiritual religion.

Then again, a more destructive consequence of the secret notion that two great powers shared the world between them, was the belief that some men were the subjects of one, and some of the other. The very essence of Pharisaism consists in this,—that one man is better loved by God than another; and that the Divine revelations are not for universal good, but for directing the Separatist how to avoid the kingdom of darkness*.

* The very subtle nature of this poison is seen in no instance so remarkably as in its reappearance in Western Christendom of late years. Modern Separatists, who have clearly adopted the leading principles of Gnosticism,—1st, that the good God does not love all men; and 2ndly, that the visible things of the world are not His; trace their opinions up to the great African bishop, who, with a Manichean education, and a life devoted to the overthrow of Eastern metaphysics, preserved a taint of dualism, which lay unnoticed for a thousand years in the ignorance of the Western world, till it burst out in those who led men back to primitive Christianity, through him who was the only one of the Latin Fathers whose theology deserved to be studied.

But lately, the Jewish mind had been turned from truth by another Gentile philosophy, coming from the West, as Gnosticism came from the East; more openly and confessedly studied than the subtle doctrines of the Persians. When all Western Asia, after the victories of Alexander, became more or less Græcised, it is not surprising that Judæa, in the very heart of the Macedonian settlements, should lose much of its Oriental character, and that the priests in the Temple, or the doctors in the Synagogue, should ape the style and the sayings of the Porch and the Academy. They discovered among the Greeks some sects similar to their own; and their native differences were increased by borrowing from their masters*. The self-righteous Traditionary, with his superstitious prostration before his wise men, and his leaning to the Gnostic abhorrence of matter, would find in the Stoic a congenial mind. Indeed, even if the Pharisaic notions of the unquestionable authority of the elders, of the vileness of the common people, and of the necessity of *displaying* religion, were not directly borrowed from the Stoical maxims, that their own wise men could do no harm; that all the world besides themselves were mad; and that rigidity constituted virtue; yet at any

* Zeno, the founder of the Stoics, and Epicurus flourished just after Judæa became acquainted with Greece. Give one century for their doctrines to be studied by the Jews, and we come to the very time when the Pharisees and Sadducees are said to have arisen. For although these *names* were not known till afterwards, when their tenets had become more confirmed and more distinctive, yet the Chasidim of the Maccabees were evidently Pharisees; while the Zadikim were not only the Sadducees, but had very probably the same name (Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 167 B.C.).

rate the obscure seeds of these notions were ripened in the sun of Gentile philosophy. We may trace, in the fasts of the Pharisees, a reflection of the contempt of all sensual enjoyment professed by the Stoics; and even their doctrines of predestination were due to the disciples of Zeno*.

On the other hand, many of the scholastic opponents of the Traditionaries readily adopted a more sensuous philosophy, not only from their dislike to the Pharisees, but also from their own doctrines inclining in the contrary direction. The Textualists, who were the farthest removed from Gnosticism, or the making of matter essentially evil, fell off into the extreme of Epicurism, or the placing of the *summum bonum* in the pleasures of the senses. The clinging to matter, and the denial of the Gnostic chains of spiritual emanations, soon grew, in both the Epicureans and Sadducees, to a denial, or at least strong doubt, of any immaterial existence at all. Their dislike to the doctrine of a particular providence led them into a denial of a resurrection; which is of itself exceedingly curious, because Warburton's reasonings against the Mosaic resurrection are founded upon that very particular providence, distorted and mistaken.

The account given by Josephus may, possibly, have been made more Greek than usual, from his desire to round off any native roughness, so disagreeable to the

* The whole scheme of modern Judaism, being the fruit of the ancient traditions, makes the decisions of the Rabbis unquestionable. Maimonides lays down that one impediment of repentance (by which he means an unpardonable sin) is "the exciting of controversy against the dicta of the wise men;" *Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 24.

state; and yet we cannot read his description^a without at once perceiving, that the Pharisees were those Traditionaries who had imbibed as much of the Stoical philosophy as was consistent with their national doctrines; while the Sadducees were those Textualists who had followed the teaching of the Epicureans^b. At the

^a "What I would now explain is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from the fathers, which are not written in the Law of Moses; and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers; and concerning these things it is that great disputes and differences have arisen among them." (Antiq. xiii. 10.)

Again: "Nor do they (the Sadducees) regard the observation of anything besides what the Law enjoins them; for they think it an instance of virtue to dispute with those teachers of philosophy whom they frequent." (Antiq. xviii. 1.) See also Bell. ii. 8; and Prideaux, Connect. sub anno 107.

^b That anciently the Sadducee was scarcely distinguishable from the Epicurean, is corroborated by the fact that the latter name is constantly used by the Talmudical Jews for an opposer of traditions, because no doubt their old antagonists were really Epicureans.

Maimonides puts down the Epicurei as one branch of those who have no portion in the world to come; and he explains Epicurei to mean those who deny the gift of prophecy, more particularly the prophetic spirit of Moses, or who assert that the Creator does not know the works of men; that is, who deny Providence (Canones Pœnitentiæ, cap. 3).

Lightfoot mentions as one of the causes of excommunication, Epicurism: "And what Epicurism means we may learn from the definition of Epicurus; Epicurus is he that despiseth the words of God; Epicurus is he that despises the scholars of the wise men." (Hor. Heb. in 1 Cor. v. 5.)

A wider definition of Epicurean is, one who has fallen from the bosom of Israel, that is, a heretic (Allen's Modern Judaism, chap. 6).

It is easy to see that this epithet, although often applied indiscriminately to heterodox Jews, is yet plainly connected with the Epicurean philosophy of the Sadducees.

same time we must be careful not to fall into the mistake that all the Jews of our Lord's time were either Pharisees or Sadducees. There were several Traditionaries who knew nothing about Gentile philosophy, and were not enrolled as members of the Separatists. The mention of Scribes and lawyers as distinct from the Pharisees, proves this; and our Lord preached against Pharisaism as something worse than the traditions^a. So also the Sadducees were but a small sect, consisting only of the rich and influential Textualists who were able to become acquainted with Greek learning, and who departed most of all from pure Judaism. These Sadducees, being thus the most inclined to a Gentile habit of thought, are sometimes confounded with the Herodians, who adopted the Roman policy^b. They were either exterminated during the two rebellions under Vespasian and Adrian, being chiefly rich men; or else, on the ruin of the nation, and the bloody persecution against them, they were of those who abjured their paternal faith, and became Gentiles. At any rate they entirely disappeared for many ages.

The Textualists, who were not Sadducees, evidently

^a Compare Luke xi. 45 with Matt. xxiii. 29. "It is not very easy distinguishing betwixt the Scribe and the Pharisee, unless that Pharisaism was a kind of tumour and excrescence as to superstition and austerities of religion, beyond the common and stated practices of that nation, even of the Scribes themselves." (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in *Luc.* xi. 45.)

"I should believe the Shammeans and the Hillelites were all against the Sadducees; and yet I should hardly believe all of them of the sect of the Pharisees." (*Hor. Heb.* in *Act.* xxiii. 9.)

^b Compare Matt. xvi. 6 with Mark viii. 15.

constituted the first generation of Christians, because they were naturally most disposed to listen to the arguments by which Christianity was proved. Indeed very probably they were nearly all converted ; for they could not, like the small sect of the Sadducees, have been either all destroyed or all paganized ; and yet nothing is said of them for many centuries after Christ.

The Pharisees, or at least the most zealous of them, degenerated into the wild fanatics who either cut each other's throats, or were crucified by the Romans. Some of the more moderate, or the more pious, became Christians ; while the rest easily gave up all their Greek philosophy during the enthusiastic resistance to the whole Gentile world, and were no longer to be distinguished from the other traditionary Jews, who have since formed the whole nation, at least until lately. The traditions were collected very soon after the establishment of the Jewish patriarchate in Tiberias, and were in that form called the Mishna ; to which were added most voluminous comments, which make up the Talmud, the real Bible of the Rabbinical Jews*.

* See Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* cap. 3, and Prideaux, *Connect.* sub anno 446 B.C.

About the middle of the eighth century, a certain influential Jew of Babylon, named Anan, with his son Saul, protested against the whole of the traditions, and founded the sect of the modern Karaites or Textualists, who are now to be found in several parts of Western Asia and Eastern Europe. Some persons assert that these Karaites are the descendants of the ancient Sadducees, but the assertion has only been caused by the name Sadducee being applied by the Talmudical Jews to them as to all their enemies. A definite date being assigned for the schism, takes away all connection between the modern Karaites and the ancient Sadducees ; nor indeed have they

The sects of Pharisees and Sadducees were, without any doubt, only foreign graftings on the old national stocks of Traditionaries and Textualists. Of course these Gentile opinions made the reception of the Gospel much more difficult with the leading public men of the day, who had, more or less, imbibed them. There is every probability that the Greek philosophy was gradually becoming more and more known during the century and a half between Alexander the Great and the Maccabees. When, however, the Macedonian monarchs of Syria endeavoured to introduce Greek idolatry, as well as Greek philosophy, against which the nation was effectually guarded; after the struggle was over between oppression and resistance, and the national worship was restored, and, we may well believe, in some particulars changed; the leaders of the reformation, being themselves addicted to *philosophy*, and to the mysticism of the Cabbala, now made so much more necessary, as the departure from the spirit of Judaism was more wide, brought into the regular service of the Synagogue, that dangerous and evasive allegorizing which formerly had existed as merely the unchecked heresies of the schools. And it may easily be imagined

anything in common, except the rejection of the traditions. It would be as reasonable to say that the Protestants among the Latin Christians are successors of the Greek church.

A schism of the same kind has also lately taken place among the Jews of London; and Christian efforts might be expected to meet with more success among those who appear to be restored to the condition of their fathers who received the Gospel. But it is to be feared that the Karaite Jews, both in the East and with us, have only left the absurdities of the Talmud to fall into a rationalism closely akin to infidelity.

what mistaken views the Jewish teachers must have adopted, when they applied that same Cabbalistic system (invented for the purpose of making the Law speak a spiritual religion) to the deducing of the rigid Gnosticism of the Porch, or, on the other hand, the materialism of Epicurus from the Divine oracles*.

It is necessary to take this Gentile aspect of the scholastic theology of our Lord's time into account, in order to arrive at something like a correct understanding of the rejection of Jesus by almost all the Jews of fortune, of rank, or of name. But yet it ought to be well borne in mind that this philosophy was not, properly speaking, a *Jewish* error, nor in fact a true consequence of the real

* "Undoubtedly the sermons, disputations, and disquisitions, formed out of the Law by the ancient doctors, were of such a kind, that not only the literal sense of sacred Scripture was explained in them, but also a certain deeper sense which was more spiritual, and, as it appeared, more agreeable to the Divine wisdom." (Vitringa, *De Synag. Vet. lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 5. p. 673.*)

"The Jews did not indulge in the allegories of speculative philosophy in the Law and the Prophets, according to my opinion, until after the time of Alexander the Great, when they began to learn, in addition (to the Scriptures), the philosophy cultivated among the Greeks. Indeed they greatly loved that study of philosophy, because it was agreeable to them on account of its novelty; and they even mixed it up with the known doctrines of the Law and the Prophets; the rather because they saw how very conformable the practical or moral philosophy of the Gentiles was to the practical precepts which are found in Moses and the Prophets. So at least they fancied. To which is to be added, that the Jews, when conversing with the heathen, thought that it would be of great service in recommending the wisdom and authority of the Divine Law to the Gentiles, if they could bring them to believe, that under the simple and clear words of the Law there lay secretly hidden lofty and subtle truths, which could not be properly explained but by means of the mysteries of a dogmatic philosophy." (*Ibid.* p. 674.)

errors which had sprung from a misconception of the Law. It was, after all, but a foreign excrescence, that concealed the plant beneath. It was the growth only of the more social position of the nation among the rest of the world. When the Jew became an enemy of all mankind, this Gentile overgrowth fell of itself; and Judaism, vitiated indeed at its core, but unencumbered and bare, showed what was the native disease that had entirely changed its external aspect.

The cause of this disease was, unquestionably, the making of the temporal Covenant an everlasting one; the forcing of the Law to speak what the Lawgiver spoke not. The whole body of the Jews were furnished by the doctors with a table of errata to the books of Moses. For the land of Canaan they were to read the kingdom of heaven; for the singularity in being in a temporal covenant with Jehovah, the monopoly of God's love. They therefore believed, with but few exceptions, that every Israelite, who did what the Law required him to do, in order to secure possession of the land,—observe circumcision, perform the rites and sacrifices, keep the sabbaths and the feasts, profess obedience to Jehovah alone, strictly abstain from images,—had done all that was required for the securing of God's favour, or the blessings of Messiah's kingdom and of the world to come; while Gentiles, who truly could not inherit the Israelites' privileges, unless they became Jews, were condemned to hopeless degradation and exclusion into outer darkness, unless they were circumcised and observed the Law.

This was *the error* which Christianity opposed, and

for which opposition it was rejected. The doctrines of inward repentance, trust in God's care, dying daily unto sin, revived by the preachers of the Gospel, formed no part of the scheme of the enemies of Jesus, because the Law did not make these requisite for possession of Canaan. As we said before, Traditionaries and Textualists alike held these doctrines; the early Apostles, as well as the Pharisees, were encumbered with them. But because the traditions made escape from this *one error* impossible, therefore did Jesus preach against the Scribes and lawyers: because Gentile philosophy had obscured even the faint vestiges of truth in the traditions, have the Pharisees, who displayed their errors in practice by placing righteousness in action, attained the undying discredit of being denounced with the only stern words that fell from the lips of the Redeemer.

CHAPTER VII.

THE JUDAISM OF JESUS.

THE result we have arrived at, namely that Judaism was not spiritual religion, although along with it a spiritual religion could be traced, will not only enable us to understand the particular fault of the Jews, who tortured the Old Covenant into a passport for heaven ; but will also set the character of our blessed Saviour in a clear light, as one who, a rigid Jew himself, both practised and taught an accurate obedience to the Mosaic Law ; while at the same time He preached the unwelcome truth, that the Prophets were the only part of the Old Scripture where individual or inward righteousness was described.

This view places us in direct opposition to the all but universal opinion that the Mosaic Law was a bad (although a divinely authorized) mode of justification, and that Jesus expressly abolished it and substituted the Gospel. It seems almost beyond apprehension, how an opinion of this kind, totally unsupported—nay, most evidently contradicted—by the New Testament, could ever have been allowed to remain the real, though hidden, root of the vast religious diversity in Christendom. The relation between Moses and Jesus is the difficulty which every theological writer both feels and shows. And, of a truth, if men are in the dilemma of reconciling what they hold to be contradictory parts of God's revelation,

by speaking of Judaism as good for nothing, and Christianity as an innovation upon God's former announcements; we cannot be surprised that on the one side a flimsy rationalism, and on the other a blind pietism, should take the place of a devout, and healthy, and reasonable religion.

The truth which stands forth prominently is this: Judaism was never a plan of individual justification; the Rabbis thought it was, and opposed Jesus because He preached Righteousness without the Law. It suited the purpose of some of the Gnostic leaders^a, who had a religion of their own to put into the place of the simple system of David and Isaiah, to represent the Lord as abrogating all the ancient faith of Israel. Subsequent ignorance mistook the Pharisees for true exponents of the Law, and the Redeemer's rebukes of the traditions, for philippics against the Old Covenant.

And although this error is chiefly mischievous in the hands of those who use it in support of their heresy, that morality and religion are not necessarily connected; or that God first recommended morality, and when it proved a failure, He then introduced the religion of these men; yet even with many others who would shrink from what is truly a consequence of the error of making Christianity take the place of Judaism, we meet occasionally

^a "Separatio Legis et Evangelii proprium et principale opus est Marcionis." (Tertullian adv. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 19.)

The Law and the Gospel are opposed certainly; because one opened the entrance to Canaan, the other to heaven. But everything in the Law, irrespective of Canaan, regards heaven. Whatever morality once had to do, it has the same work now.

with such unfounded assertions as that Jesus “promulgated the abrogation of some laws^a;” or, that “He exercised a right, not only to explain and enforce the Mosaic laws, but to repeal, to alter, and to improve them^b.”

If these assertions were correct, we should indeed be sorely embarrassed in endeavouring to prove that Moses and Jesus were prophets of two separate though harmonious systems. But a very little examination will fully prove that not only did our Lord not abrogate one jot of the Law, but that He insisted on a return to the proper obedience to it. And it must be remembered that, in making this examination, we are not, at present, concerned with any *future cessation* of Judaism. My object is to prove that during the lifetime of Jesus, the Law was unbroken by any but by His enemies.

Our Lord was brought, in the course of His ministry, to refer to eight of the distinct laws of Moses; and in all, He will be found to vindicate them from either an unfair interpretation, or an imperfect obedience; so far was He from doing away with them. These laws are, the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh commandments of the Decalogue, the rule of retaliation, the treatment of an enemy, and the practice of divorce.

With the exception of the questions of the sabbath and of divorce, there can be no misunderstanding. Every one agrees that when He declared, “Ye have heard how it hath been said by the elders^c, Thou shalt not kill, thou

^a Grotius de Veritate, v. 7.

^b Graves on the Pentateuch, iii. 6. sect. 1.

^c ἐπὶ τῇ τοῖς ἀρχαῖς. *Vetus est traditio.* Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt. v. 21.

shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt perform unto Jehovah thine oaths; but I say unto you, Thou shalt not even be angry with thy brother, or harbour an impure thought, or make *any* irreverent oath,"—He was denouncing the doctrine of the Scribes, that a man was guiltless of sin, if he abstained from the criminal acts of murder and of adultery, and did not profane the one holy word Jehovah^a. So also in His notice of the fifth commandment, He taught that the quibbling of the Scribes had made the Law of no effect, when they allowed any one to free himself from his duty to his parents by making a *corban* of his property, or pretending to devote it to sacred purposes.

. Again, when He said, with reference to the law—"An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"—that we ought not to resist evil; it is manifest that He objected, not to the law in its true import, and which was nothing but a rule to guide the magistrate in his judgements, but to the *illegal* right which the Jews claimed, from that misunderstood passage, of retaliating like for like on those who privately injured them^b.

The Pharisaic doctrine of loving neighbours and hating enemies had no support in the unadulterated Law, which enjoined indeed the love of a neighbour; but, far from sanctioning hatred of strangers, commanded that they also should be loved^c.

^a Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, book v. arts. 301–303.

^b Exod. xxi. 24; Lev. xxiv. 20; Deut. xix. 21. See also Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, book v. art. 242.

^c Lev. xix. 13–18; Deut. x. 19. And yet, in opposition to this plain inference, Neander says, "The Old Law enjoined the love of

And when we perceive that the notices of these laws were preceded by such sayings as, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven;" or, "Why do ye transgress the commandments of God by your tradition?"—it becomes clear that He not only allowed the Law to remain, but insisted on men's rigidly obeying it; and publicly expressed that to be the burden of His discourses.

Some persons, however, profess to make a distinction between the Moral and the Ceremonial laws. The Saviour, it is said, upheld the first, while He came to do away with the second. But, indeed, there is no expression in the words of Jesus to show that He distinguished between two parts of the Jewish Law. And not only so, but throughout the whole Bible, the expressions Moral and Ceremonial Law nowhere occur^b. To the Jew every command of God rested upon the same authority; he could no more violate one part than another. I conceive that the true difference is between what was of natural right, and what was confined to the one nation of Israel and the one climate of Palestine. This difference is intelligible and well-founded; but it entirely removes all Jewish authority from the so-called

one's neighbour, but none were regarded as neighbours but members of the Theocratic community; and therefore the Law implied hatred of the enemies of that community, as enemies of the kingdom of God. The law of Christ, on the contrary, enjoins love without limit." (*Life of Jesus Christ*, book v. part 1. sect. 155.)

^a Matt. v. 19, xv. 3; Mark vii. 9.

^b So also says the deep and godly-minded Tholuck in his note on Rom. iii. 20.

Moral Law, to which the whole world is bound; not because it is Mosaic, but because it is natural.

We should unquestionably be bound not to rob or kill, although we had never heard of the ten commandments; and yet, let it be observed, the injunction to honour parents, of universal application, is, as it stands in the Decalogue, addressed only to Israel; because the annexed promise, to inherit the land, was not held out to Gentiles. So likewise the threat of visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, appended to the first and second commandments, bore exclusive reference to the temporal and heritable covenant of circumcision; while no one doubts that we are all bound to refrain from polytheism and image-worship.

It belongs not to our present inquiry to point out how we can arrive at the knowledge of a difference between right and wrong. But, most assuredly, the Scripture writers assume that we have such a power, however imperfectly it may have been exercised^a. And I think that those persons who shrink from Bishop Butler's rule, of making virtue to consist in following (perfect) nature, would not only be unable to deduce a system of ethics for all men from the Bible, but would find that in endeavouring to do so, they were but following the rejected rule of natural fitness. For it is allowed that the New Testament offers no fresh code of morals; and that we must distinguish for ourselves, in the Old Testament, between what is of eternal duration and what has passed away. I know not how this can be done but by adopting

^a See especially Acts xvii. 29; Romans ii. 15.

some such rule as Bishop Butler's; and whoever does adopt that rule, admits that the Bible alone cannot tell us all that is good and all that is bad. The Law of Moses was indeed the best imaginable for Israel; but, in its entire form, it has no claims upon the uncircumcision;—while yet it is perfectly true that there are a great many things in it, founded upon natural and unchangeable morality, and, so far, of unlimited authority.

These observations are necessary, in order to prevent any false conclusions respecting the fourth commandment. If it is considered as offered to us only on the ground of being part of the Mosaic Law, I cannot conceive why the same reason ought not to oblige us to observe the feasts of new moons. If we keep a Sabbath, because it is meet and right *for us* to do so, and do not keep the feasts of new moons, because that meetness and rightness do not appear, what is this but confessing that the Old Jewish Law cannot, by itself, tell *us* what to do and what to leave undone? The Jew also could no more observe his Sabbath on the first day of the week, than he could cease to observe it at all; and I find no word of inspired authority to change the day.

And this consideration in no way whatever affects the inquiry how Christians ought to keep Sunday. Not only is it a fair question, whether the hallowing of one day out of seven do not rest on broader foundations than on the Jewish Law; but, as far as I am individually concerned, I avow myself unwaveringly convinced that such an investigation would establish an urgent

duty bound on Christians to cleave fast to that hallowing. But the notion that we must hallow the Mosaic Sabbath, will not bear the test of a moment's thought : first, because the Jewish Law, as such, has no claims upon Gentiles ; and secondly, because no Gentile Christian does observe, or ever has observed, the day which Moses enjoined*.

* Hence, if any persons insist that the positive commandment, given in the Law of Moses, is the only, or even the chief, ground for our present observance of Sunday ; for what reason do they presume to light a fire on that day (which is the only specification of work in the Pentateuch, and is manifestly adapted to a warm climate, and the Jewish mode of reckoning the day : see Exod. xxxv. 3 ; and Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, book iv. art. 195) ? Nay, we may go a step farther and ask, why they find fault with those who absent themselves from Divine service on that day, which Moses nowhere enjoined ? Jesus did neither abrogate nor modify the Law of the Sabbath. The history of the Acts of the Apostles is silent on any change having occurred. And therefore, if the Mosaic command be still binding, who can dare to take authority to alter particular parts ?

Before the destruction of Jerusalem, the *Jewish* Christians kept both the Sabbath and the Lord's day, and therefore did not regard the meaning of the two to be identical. It is also evident that the Sabbath was not considered binding upon *Gentile* Christians, for two reasons : first, if it had been, it would certainly have been mentioned as one of the necessary things in the Apostolic decree ; and secondly, a Gentile, if poor, and especially if a slave, could not have observed the Sabbath in a heathen country. The magistrate would have forced him to work. We are then, it is said, driven to the conclusion that at an early time after the close of the Apostolic history, the day was changed. But I cannot discover that there is any foundation whatever for this supposition. It will be sufficient to adduce two passages from Christian writers who lived at a time not far removed from the age of the Apostles, and who (whatever allowances we may have to make for errors or fancies) do most assuredly speak as if the Mosaic Law of the Sabbath was not in existence.

The Epistle of Barnabas, which bears internal marks, not to be

Still less does this conclusion affect the teaching of Jesus, who was a Jew, and spoke only to Jews, while

misunderstood, of having been written after the cessation of Judaism, by one who, although professedly deserting Rabbinism, could not abandon the cabbalistic exegesis upon which Rabbinism was founded, mentions the Jewish Sabbath as typical of a supposed millennium; and in corroboration of this view (in which I believe many Christian fathers concur) he appeals to Psalm xc. 4, as a very curious proof (!), not that the Jewish Sabbath was of any use, but that the one day was really intended to mean a thousand years. And then, although immediately afterwards he says that the Jewish Sabbath was also prefigurative of the Christian Sunday, yet I fancy that few modern Christians would acquiesce in the mode of interpreting this type, namely that God hated the seventh day in order that he might introduce the Sunday; and that the rest of the Sabbath signified nothing but His recommencement (of work) on the eighth day. (Epist. Barn. cap. 15.)

Justin Martyr, much better acquainted with Christianity than the trifling Jew who wrote the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, has the following remarkable passage: "If we are not agreed on these points, you will fall into absurd notions, as that He was not the same God to Enoch and all the others, who had no circumcision of the flesh, and did not observe sabbaths Do you consider that the elements are not idle, nor do they sabbatize. Remain as you were born. For if before Abraham there was no need of circumcision, nor before Moses of sabbaths, and feasts, and offerings, neither is there now any need of them." (Dialog. cum Tryphone, cap. 23.) I have no intention of defending the argument of the philosopher. But it never would have been of the smallest force, or indeed could have been proposed by him, if the Christians of his time (a hundred years after Christ's death) were used to regard the Lord's day as identical with the Sabbath.

Were there no *natural* reason for observing a day of rest, the fourth commandment would have no claims upon us. But there *is* natural reason. For, even waiving the two facts; first, that the artificial division of time into weeks was not confined to the Hebrew nation; and secondly, that the only additional service enjoined in the Law was a holocaust, and therefore not of Jewish significance; we have the truth, universally admitted, that the Christian day of

their covenant was in force. The indefinite notion on the minds of so many, that our Lord abolished the Jewish

rest is a vast blessing to mankind. Hence, as soon as we are satisfied that a general violation of the Sunday would induce evil, then it follows that any one's individual violation helps that evil, and is consequently *sin*, according to St. Paul's definition. (Rom. i. 18 and vi. 23.)

And yet it seems unaccountable that, if this were so, the founders of the Christian church did not perpetuate the observance. To this it may be answered; first, that their not doing so no more removes our obligation, than their not promulgating a decree concerning perjury, sanctions false or profane swearing; and secondly, that it was manifestly impossible for Christians to observe a general day of rest, while the state remained antichristian; and therefore the first few generations of believers were not instructed to look upon a Sabbath as necessary.

It would appear as if, for some years, things were in this condition. The great body of Christians knew of no Sabbath, but kept their religious meetings on the first day of the week. Afterwards, when Christians sat on the tribune, and hoped to wear the purple, the duties of the Jewish Sabbath were transferred to the Sunday, for two reasons, the one a worthy, and the other an unworthy one. The first was the evident good which a holy day of repose effected; the second was the misapprehension that the Mosaic Law was a spiritual, eternal Law.

It would be well, however, if many modern religionists could understand, that the Sabbath they think of was not the legal, but the traditionary Sabbath; a gloomy, blighting, deadening day, instead of a day of joy, and thanksgiving, and blessing.

My own convictions are firmly settled, that it is the duty of us all—a duty that may not be lightly considered—to refrain from our secular occupations, and to bless God in the congregation, on the Lord's day. But so long as these duties are regarded as morose, burdensome, and unnatural, so long will religion maintain only a secondary rank in social estimation.

In concluding this long note, I cannot forbear calling attention to the fact, that the above mode of dealing with this important question entirely removes the ordinary objection, viz. that the Sabbath was an observance of the Ceremonial Law, and that Jesus abolished it.

Sabbath, and substituted the Christian Sunday, is nothing but an unwarranted fancy. He rebuked, not the *legal*, but the *illegal* observance of the day ; and required the same obedience as Moses had enjoined. The Law declares that no work shall be done ; and very evidently looks for nothing but abstinence from the usual secular pursuits. For, not only would absolute cessation from every work be impossible, but, as our Saviour argues, the Law, which commanded some additional labour in the Temple on the sabbath, did certainly not mean to require such an absolute cessation. The Traditionaries, however, rightly perceiving that no one could be free from work of some kind, thought they might lay down detailed rules, what could be done, and what might be left undone. They *illegally* taught that it was proper to water an ox, or to circumcise a child, but improper to pluck an ear of corn, or to cure a paralytic. It was in answer to these doctrines that our Lord laid down His maxim, The Sabbath was made for man, or for man's good ; and therefore these traditionary rules, by turning the Sabbath into a burden upon man, set at nought the intention of the commandment. And if, He continued, the service of the Temple justifies acts, not positively forbidden, much more is my authority sufficient to sanction other acts, not prohibited. When also He told them that, if they had known their own Law, they would not have condemned those who were really guiltless of breaking it ; He could never have silenced His opponents, if His own observance of the sabbath, however right in itself, had been against a Mosaic command. It was evident

therefore, in this instance, as in others, that far from preaching a cessation of the Law, He was denouncing the false doctrines which nullified it.

The last commandment to be considered is that relating to *divorce*, which it is sometimes said that Jesus abolished. I believe, indeed, that this is the only example adduced by those who unthinkingly repeat that the Lord "promulgated the abrogation of some laws." Now I am confident that if any one will compare the words of this law, as it really stood in the Pentateuch, with the decision of Jesus, it will be rendered perfectly evident that He was siding with Moses against his false interpreters. The law of adultery was that a *convicted* woman should die^a. But, in order to prevent too much blood among a society whose wickedness (*σκληροκαρδία*) would have rendered such convictions only too common, Moses afterwards modified this strict law. Although execution still was to follow conviction, yet in some cases the woman was permitted to clear herself by taking a solemn oath that she was innocent^b; and in others (I doubt not where the woman refused to take this oath), the man, if persuaded of his wife's guilt, could send her away privately, without bringing her to trial^c. This was the evident rule of divorce, which Joseph was about to follow, when he suspected his espoused wife Mary. No wrong could have been done to the woman; because, if she refused either the purgation by the bitter

^a Lev. xx. 10.

^b Numb. v. 11-31. See Chap. IV. of this book, at page 111.

^c Deut. xxiv. 1-4.

water or an open trial, there could be little doubt that she was guilty. And therefore the Law of Moses allowed of no divorce, but *in some cases* where there was adultery.

In the time of our Saviour's ministry, the traditionary Jews were divided into two schools, that of Hillel and that of Schammai, who interpreted the Law differently in many particulars, but in none more remarkably than in the question of divorce. The school of Schammai, which was the more scriptural, taught that divorce was not to be practised except for adultery. That of Hillel dropped out the second half of the sentence in Deuteronomy ^a, and looking only to the first half, "that she find no favour in his eyes," sanctioned divorce for any cause, even the most trivial ^b.

In the attempt which the Scribes were making to draw Jesus into anti-Mosaic discourses, they set before Him this scholastic difficulty. He decided that, according to the original institution of marriage, divorce was not supposed to exist. They then pressed Him with what, they asserted, was the command of Moses. "No!" replied the Saviour, "Moses gave no such command. He *permitted* you to do so for one offence, which offence was due to your wickedness ^c. This sin, not provided for in

^a Deut. xxiv. 1.

^b Such as the appearing abroad unveiled; the swallowing of a fly in the drink, &c. See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt. v. 27-32 et xix. 3-8.

^c Σκληροκαρδία, *hardness of heart*, is never used in the Scriptures for cruelty of one human being to another; but sometimes for *want of perception* (as at Mark xvi. 14; Heb. iii. 8); or else for *general depravity* (as at this place, and at Rom. ii. 5). The meaning therefore cannot be, that Moses tolerated divorce, in order to protect the

the first idea of wedlock, rendered a permission of the kind necessary. But for this alone Moses permitted divorce; and not, as you Hillelites pretend, for any cause, according to the husband's pleasure." If such be our Lord's meaning, how did He promulgate the abrogation of the law, when, in truth, He sided with one established mode of interpretation among the least blinded of the Scribes themselves^a?

This entire accordance of Jesus with the true sense of the Mosaic commands, will enable us to take quite literally the expression in His Sermon on the Mount, that He

wife from the husband's cruelty; still less, that the law was bad, because men were bad: but that men's wickedness produced *πορνεία*; and this being so, marriage was no longer what it was supposed to be when it was said, Let a man cleave to his wife;—in fact, the marriage contract was annulled, and therefore divorce was necessary. If men were without *πορνεία*, there would be no divorce. And Jesus only explained the meaning of Moses; He certainly did not oppose him.

In the same way Tertullian compares the pristine innocence of the Romans, which did not require divorce, with the wickedness of his own times, when divorce was considered the very "fruit of marriage." (Apology, chap. 6.)

^a The opinion of Lightfoot on this subject is well worth attending to, as few understood the Judaism of the New Testament better than he did. "The Saviour does not abrogate, but tolerates the *Mosaic* permission of divorce, only restrained within the Mosaic limits; that is, in the case of adultery; and condemns that licence in the Jewish canons which permitted it for every cause." (Hor. Heb. in Matt. v. 32.)

Michaelis supposes that the permission in question refers, not to adultery (properly speaking), but to the case mentioned at Deut. xxii. 13–21. (Laws of Moses, book iii. art. 93.)

Let it be observed that Luke (xvi. 18) introduces the decision of Jesus with respect to divorce, as an example to His declaration that not one tittle of the Law should fail.

came to fulfill the Law as well as the Prophets^a; which expression means, that His mission was to restore the proper teaching of mere Judaism, as well as of spiritual religion. There can be no allusion to His being the antitype of the Levitical institutions; for not only did He refrain from drawing attention publicly to an atonement, even up to the close of His ministry; but the connection of the passage itself sufficiently proves, that He was referring to the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees, which virtually set the Law at nought. He came therefore to fulfill the Law, in the same sense as Paul fulfilled the word of God^b, by inculcating perfect obedience to it.

In almost every instance when Jesus rebuked the Scribes, it was for nullifying the Law^c; while their charge against Him was, that He transgressed the *traditions*^d. And this contrast is the more remarkable, because, although they thought to convict Him of violating the Law, when He allowed His disciples to pluck some corn on the sabbath, they failed. Jesus vindicated their conduct by a reference to the Law^e. His enemies were evidently baffled in their repeated attempts to make Him speak against Moses. At His trial before the Sanhedrim, His judges sought for legal proof, and *found none*. They were therefore obliged, as a last resource, to intimidate Pilate into condemning Him without the Law, which they dared not do on their own authority. And is it at all intelligible, that they would have been so

^a Matt. v. 17-20.

^b Col. i. 25.

^c Matt. xv. 3, xxiii. 23; Mark vii. 8, 9, 13; John vii. 19.

^d Matt. ix. 14, xv. 2; Mark ii. 18, vii. 5.

^e Matt. xii. 5.

perplexed, if He had been heard to preach that any of the laws of Moses were to be abrogated ?

The subsequent conduct of His disciples fully proves that they, at any rate, had never understood their Master even to imply that He had put an end to the authority of Moses ; for they went off into another direction of error, and, but for a special interference, would have bound the Levitical Law upon Gentiles.

It is however clear, that in most of these cases, our Lord was led to exhibit His own perfect accordance with the Law, only because His enemies thought that He was preaching otherwise. There must have been, therefore, some reason for their so thinking ; and I conceive it to have been, His very pointedly insisting that individual, spiritual religion was to be gathered, not from the Law, but from the Prophets. The Scribes were impressed with the error, that nothing was to be held as necessary but what was deduced from the Law ; and they seem to have been surprised and embarrassed, when they discovered that, although the teacher of Nazareth proclaimed spiritual religion from the other parts of Scripture, they still could not prove Him a despiser of Moses. We find that in several discourses and sentences of our Lord, He not only preached evangelical righteousness from the Prophets, but intimated that His purpose was to quote from them particularly.

This is strikingly the case in the Sermon on the Mount ; the text of which, the burden of the discourse, afterwards commented on, is, if not literally quoted from the Psalms and Isaiah, so like certain passages in those

old devotional books, that, when we look to the subsequent appeal to the prophets^a, there cannot be much doubt that He had their words specially in His mind, and intended His hearers to listen to what the holy men of old had said.

From these Scriptures we read, "I will look upon him that is poor and of a contrite spirit: I will comfort all that mourn: The meek shall inherit the earth: And my servants shall eat: Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble: He that hath clean hands and a pure heart shall ascend into the hill of the Lord: And those who desire life, must seek peace and ensue it^b."

There is not only a very close resemblance between these passages and the opening part of the Sermon on the Mount; but if the Septuagint version of some of them be referred to, it will be seen that St. Matthew uses the actual Greek words. And our Saviour employs a peculiarly Jewish phrase, *inheriting the earth or land*; which was, properly, a promise annexed to the Old Covenant, but which often appeared in the Prophets, *figuratively*, to denote general blessings; and is evidently repeated by Jesus, because it occurred in the writings of those from whom He was quoting.

If, moreover, we attend to the connection of the whole sermon, we perceive that He exhorted the people to imitate the prophets^c. And immediately afterwards, the

^a Matt. v. 12.

^b Isaiah lxvi. 2, lxi. 2; Psalm xxxvii. 11; Isaiah lxv. 13; Psalm xli. 1, xxiv. 3, 4, xxxiv. 14.

^c Matt. v. 12; Luke vi. 23.

symbolical likening of the Jews to salt that ought not to have lost his savour ; to a city set on a hill, that ought not to have been hidden ; and to a candle, that ought not to have been put under a bushel (referring plainly to something cast out and rendered worthless) ;—seems so decidedly to be a rebuke to the whole nation for having concealed the evangelical parts of Scripture, that it is wonderful it does not strike everyone. And, in order to show that He was speaking about the prophetic *writings*, He continued to declare that His mission was to fulfill both Law and Prophets.

Again, our Lord made frequent mention of the persecution of the prophets ; and even charged that generation with sharing in the sin. Now, although some of the old prophets were individually ill-treated by wicked rulers, I cannot discover that generally theirs was an afflicted profession. Elijah fled from Jezebel, and Jeremiah was thrown into a dungeon ; but it is certain that the nation of Israel, in other ages at least, disapproved and lamented these crimes. Therefore, at first sight, these rebukes of our Lord, if understood to have reference to the *personal* sufferings of the prophets, do not seem borne out by facts. But, as soon as we suppose Him to be denouncing the rejection of the prophetic doctrines, this was a national sin, not confined to the fatuity of a few individuals, but affecting the whole people ; and, in this sense, He had grounds for declaring that the prophets were persecuted by that generation.

This view of the meaning of our Lord's rebukes sets in a clear light a very remarkable passage in His life ;

where He distinctly charges the Lawyers, that they bore witness unto themselves that they were the children of those who killed the Prophets; while yet it was very plain that these Lawyers said with truth and sincerity, that, if they had been in the days of their fathers, they would not have been partakers with them in their evil deeds^a.

It is the opinion of Lightfoot, that the Lawyers (*νομικοι*) were those Traditionaries who had not adopted the Gentile philosophy, or the extravagant formality, of the Pharisees^b. In general, when our Lord denounced the traditions, He spoke of Pharisaism especially, as the most distinguishing tenet of the sect, and as the practical consequence of Rabbinism, which most concerned the people. But in the particular rebuke we are considering, He brings out the Lawyers as different from the Pharisees;

^a Luke xi. 48 and Matt. xxiii. 30.

^b Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Luc. xi. 45. The contrary opinion, that the Lawyers were Textualists (Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, liv. ii. chap. 9; Neander's *Life of Jesus Christ*, sect. 166 & 250), is not supported by the Evangelists. For, the same rebukes uttered, in Matthew, against the Scribes and Pharisees, are, in Luke, directed against the Lawyers; evidently proving that the things which Jesus was denouncing, were professed so equally by both Lawyers and Pharisees, that Matthew did not think it worth while to denote the difference, as the more exact and critical Luke did.

The opinion that the *νομικοι* were Textualists, seems to have arisen from the mistake, that the Traditionaries, rejecting all Scripture, could not be so called. Whereas, in truth, the title is pertinent to them, because they neglected all the Scripture except the Law. The Textualists, on the other hand, did not require the traditions, because they did not profess to look exclusively to the Law; and therefore they were not Lawyers^c.

Whichever opinion we adopt, will not affect the above conclusions.

and the charge He makes against them is, that they concealed, or rejected, or were ignorant of the Prophets.

After He had exclaimed, Woe unto you Pharisees for your hypocrisy, the non-Pharisaic Lawyers desired to know whether, in so saying, He reproached them. And He continued, Woe unto you *also*, ye Lawyers; proceeding to declare why they deserved woe as well as the Pharisees.

I do not know whether it has struck other persons as it struck me, that, according to the common view, the reasons given by our Lord for including the Lawyers with the Pharisees seem unintelligible and unconnected. For, what has the lading the people with grievous burdens, and the taking away the key of knowledge, to do with the murder of some of the prophets by the more ancient Jews? And what is meant by that generation building the sepulchres of the Prophets, and so declaring that they allowed the deeds of their fathers?

But, if we read this passage with the understanding that Jesus is rebuking the Lawyers, not for killing, but for rejecting and concealing the Prophets, it becomes consistent and plain. He tells them that the building and garnishing of the tombs of the Prophets, and the assertion that they disallowed the murder of them, did not excuse them from sharing in the guilt, so long as they rejected the same prophets as their fathers did (though in another sense). Their concealment of these old evangelical teachers was a taking away of the key of knowledge (because theirs were the only inspired books that taught how God was to be won); and, by telling the

people that the Law of outward acts was *the key*, they laid on them a burden grievous to be borne. This concealment of the Prophets was figuratively represented by building their tombs; and was a testimony from themselves, in spite of their assertions to the contrary, that they were actuated by the same spirit as their fathers were; and it was, in fact, a proof that they allowed these evil deeds.

As this very remarkable passage throws great light on our Lord's prophetic mission, in removing these legal burdens, and restoring the evangelical key of the kingdom; it will also serve to explain the force of His peculiar phrase, *The Law and the Prophets*, when speaking of the entire Scriptures, as contrasting somewhat strongly with the usual expression *The Law* only. Everyone, at all conversant with Jewish writings, is aware of the custom of speaking of the Law by itself^a. And the oppo-

^a The Jews always put Moses into a higher grade than the other prophets. A denial of the prophetic spirit of *Moses* is held, by Maimonides, to be an exceedingly grave offence (*Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 3.).

It is worthy of remark, that Justin Martyr, while he constantly refers to the Old Testament as containing Christianity, yet speaks only of the Prophets. And this custom seems to me to be an imitation of the plain teaching of Jesus; while, at the same time, it shows that he did not consider the Law as at all prefigurative of the Gospel. For, although the Prophets were not always non-Judaical, and the Law sometimes referred to a *protevangelium*; yet, as a general rule, Moses represented Judaism, and the Prophets stood for the evangelical faith of Israel. In one passage of the "Cohortatio," very curiously, he says that Plato derived his knowledge of the unity and eternity of God *from Moses*; but his notions of the resurrection, *from the Prophets*. In his dialogue with Trypho, he recommends the Jew to the Prophets; while the Jew recommends him to the Law. (Chap. 8.)

nents of our Lord adopted the same phraseology^a. While the joining together of the Law and the Prophets was so peculiar to Jesus, that, whereas scarcely any one else spoke of the Scriptures by that name, save when there was a manifest reference to the *predictions* in the Prophets^b; He, almost without exception, joined the Law and the Prophets together, if He was not intending to speak of the Law alone^c.

Sometimes our Saviour spoke of the two together, in a way marked so as to show that He was expressly opposing the usual separation of them. For instance, there was a Jewish maxim, "Do not to your neighbour what is hateful to yourself, *for this is the whole Law.*" Jesus, in declaring the same duty, says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, *for this is the Law and the Prophets*^d." And at another time, when a Lawyer asked Him which was the greatest commandment *in the Law*, He, after having answered the question, added, On these two commandments hang all *the Law and the Prophets*^e.

From these very striking particulars of His preaching,

^a John vii. 49, xii. 34; Acts xviii. 13.

^b As at John i. 45; Acts xxviii. 23.

^c See Matt. v. 17, vii. 12, xi. 13; Luke xvi. 16. When Jesus spoke of the Law by itself, He meant *only* the Judaism in the Pentateuch; as at Matt. v. 18, xii. 5; Luke xvi. 17; John vii. 19, 23. There are, indeed, two places where Jesus quotes from the Psalms under the title of the Law (John x. 34 & xv. 25); but here He is only adopting *Jewish* quotations; He does not say *the Law*, but *your Law*, and *their Law*.

^d Matt. vii. 12. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. *in loco*.

^e Matt. xvii. 36, 40.

we readily see Jesus in an essentially anti-Rabbinical character. His mission (as a teacher) was neither to propound a system of ethics, nor to declare that God had changed His rule of right and wrong ; but to give greater clearness to what ought always to have been evangelical truth, and to bring back His own nation from the darkness into which they had fallen. In acting up to this character, He did not utter His denunciations against the most wicked, or the most sceptical, or the most opposed to the Gospel ; but *exclusively* against the particular sect, whose doctrines had riveted these traditionary errors. Hence, while ignorance of the Prophets, and perversion of the Law, were the *things* He preached against (being common to nearly the whole people), He never publicly opposed any *persons*, except the traditionary Scribes, the Lawyers and the Pharisees.

We have seen that the textualist Jews, even with the same errors as the Traditionaries, and probably with the same desire to strain the Law beyond its proper bounds, yet had not adopted the Rabbinical principles, that the Law by itself was insufficient for uttering spiritual religion, that the Prophets did not explain the Law as was required, and that the words of the wise men, the only true exponents of the Law, were of unquestionable authority. Therefore when Jesus came to draw forth the Prophets from their concealment, and point them out to the people, He was brought into direct antagonism with the Traditionaries only. It is for this reason that He so often declared that the commandments of men had made those of God without effect ; and that, in the very begin-

ning of His ministry, He warned His hearers that their righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.

This same warning also appeared with greater sternness at the close of His life. And, in order to express His uncompromising hostility to the whole system of Rabbinism, He enjoined on His disciples that they were not to be called by the names of Rabbi, or Father, or Master, *because these were the names taken by the Scribes*, who meant by them that they possessed an authority without appeal^a. There can be no doubt that our Lord referred merely to the *technical* use of these words; because no one imagines that we are hereby prohibited from giving the name of Father, or Master, to those who, in other and genuine senses, bear these relations to us. The Redeemer told them that God was their Father, and Christ their Master, in the way that the Rabbis claimed to be. God, and His manifestation in Christ, were the only authorities that admitted of no question^b.

^a Matt. xxiii. 1-12. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. *in loco*. It is worthy of notice, that the early Christians, although they adopted so many of the Jewish ecclesiastical titles, as those of Elder, Deacon, Pastor, Bishop, and even Angel, yet seem to have scrupulously avoided these names of Rabbi, Father, or Master.

^b It must have been well known to the enemies of our Lord, that He was eminently an anti-traditionary. And, unless we take this into account, we shall not be able to understand the peculiar craft of the question put to Him by the Sadducees, at the time when they were seeking to entangle Him in His talk; that is, to draw Him into a conversation wherein He should say something against Moses.

The Sadducees, opposing the doctrine of the resurrection, rested upon the fact that Moses did not speak of it. The Traditionaries acknowledged that the Law, *without the traditions*, could not plainly

This view will also fully account for His *apparently* sole persecution by the Pharisees. The quarrel from the first *seems* to have been with them ; while, after His death, they often befriended the Apostles, who were opposed chiefly by the Sadducees. The reason usually given for this change is, that the Sadducees were irritated with the Apostles for preaching the resurrection, which favoured the opinions of the Pharisees. But I do not think this reason sufficient. The silence concerning the Sadducees is more expressive in the Gospels ; for although a great many favourable things are said of individual Pharisees, yet there is no good word for any Sadducee.

A Pharisee once desired the company of Jesus^a ; on another occasion several of them gave Him friendly warning against danger^b. Nicodemus, Gamaliel, Saul,—admirable men,—were Pharisees. Yet nothing of this kind is said of the Sadducees.

And indeed, if we look carefully, we shall see that the Sadducees opposed Him quite as much as any other sects ; they joined the Pharisees in tempting Him ; and although they are not *mentioned* as bringing about His death, they must have been more prominent in it than the Pharisees ; because Caiaphas and his adherents were of their party^c.

teach it. Hence, in their wicked combination against Jesus, they set before Him this often-mooted difficulty. Knowing that He held the doctrine of the resurrection ; knowing that He would not say anything in favour of the traditions ; they concluded that He must be induced to say that the Law of Moses was wrong, in not speaking of a life after death. His answer, avoiding this dilemma, not only showed that the doctrine was in the Pentateuch, but that it could be seen there without the need of the Cabbala.

^a Luke xi. 37.

^b Luke xiii. 31.

^c Acts v. 17.

And I am well-disposed to believe that the chief priests, who accused Him before Pilate of teaching sedition against Cæsar, were Sadducees also; because it is not probable that the Pharisees could, with their well-known political bias, have preferred such an accusation^a.

And yet it is very singular that Jesus never *publicly* preached against them. When they pressed Him with a difficulty, He answered them, and declared how much they were in error^b. Once He warned His disciples *privately*, to beware of the leaven of the Sadducees^c; but He did not follow them up, and denounce woes unto them, as to the Scribes and Pharisees; while it is certain that their distinguishing tenets were more hostile to His doctrines than anything the Pharisees held. Nay, although He often spoke of truths directly in opposition to their sceptical views; as when His constant recommendation of prayer and reliance on an individual providence, seems particularly leveled against their Epicurean philosophy^d; yet He abstained from mentioning their names.

And the reason of this is evident: His mission was to restore the Prophets, and abolish the traditions; to allow the external righteousness of the Law, for the purposes which Moses allowed it for; and to declare that it was inward righteousness which obtained God's favour. Now the traditionary Scribes taught, and the Pharisees practised, the contrary; therefore against them only did He

^a It would seem as if the expression "chief priests and elders" were equivalent to "Sadducees and Pharisees."

^b Matt. xxii. 23-33; Mark xii. 18-27; Luke xx. 27-38.

^c Matt. xvi. 6.

^d Matt. vi. 19-34, x. 28-31; Luke xi. 1-13, xii. 4-32, &c.

preach. And this satisfactorily explains, not only why our Saviour took no notice whatever of the Essenes, who did not force themselves in His way as the Sadducees did ; but also why He did not speak more against other men's wickedness ; since He only fulfilled perfectly His mission as a restorer of the Law and the Prophets ; and left immorality to be condemned, as it had always been.

Before we proceed, it is necessary to notice an opinion, attractive though untenable, with reference to the prophetic character of Jesus, namely that He and His disciples were ordained Rabbis, with full license to preach in the synagogues. The grounds for this opinion seem to be threefold :—(1.) That they actually did preach in the synagogues. (2.) That Jesus was not put out of the synagogue, or excommunicated, which is hard to be accounted for but upon the supposition that He was a Rabbi, since the Jews would go almost any lengths before they would excommunicate such, “lest a handle should be given to the Gentiles to find fault*.” (3.) That Jesus is frequently called Rabbi^b.

This opinion will not bear investigation ; the three grounds above specified are not sufficient to establish it.

(1.) The fact that Jesus frequently preached in the synagogue, by no means proves Him to have been an ordained Rabbi ; because any one of sufficient learning could be called upon to do so by the ruler, although in

* Vitringa, *De Synag.* lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 7 & 11 ; Beausobre, *Introduction*, under the head *Synagogue*.

^b John i. 38, 49 ; iii. 2, 26 ; vi. 25.

most cases the Rabbi would be the only fit person present^a. Jesus having given proof of His great power and knowledge, there was nothing extraordinary in His being selected, especially if, as appears to have been sometimes the case, the ruler was His friend^b.

(2.) There is no reason for concluding that Jesus was not excommunicated; the silence of the narrators proves nothing, for the excommunication of the twelve is not mentioned; and yet, if our Lord's words were true, they were afterwards put out of the synagogue^c. Moreover, a careful attention to some circumstances will induce a very strong suspicion that the same course was adopted towards Him. His preaching in the synagogue is related only in the earlier part of His ministry, when there was no organized opposition to Him. In the latter part, when the Sanhedrim were bent upon His death, He is not said to have preached there. Then also it is to be noticed that at first He seems to have been *generally* followed; He went where He would. Towards the close of His ministry we are told that many of His disciples went back^d; that men would not speak openly of Him for fear of the Jews (that is, according to John's usual phraseology, the Jewish rulers); and that they wondered why the rulers allowed Him to speak in public^e. These facts, joined to the dread of Him, and the shrinking from Him, manifested by the people, when, in spite of the protest of His disciples, He again came into Judæa to

^a See Vitringa, lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 7.

^b Matt. ix. 18; Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41; John xii. 42.

^c John xvi. 2.

^d John vi. 66.

^e John vii. 13 & 26.

raise up Lazarus (so, by the miracle, producing a temporary reaction in His favour^a)—all bespeak a man under a ban, and afford strong grounds for believing that Jesus actually was excommunicated. To which fact I think He himself made allusion when He predicted the excommunication of His disciples, immediately in connection with the assertion that “the servant is not above his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you^b.”

And even if it be doubted whether Jesus was put out of the synagogue; yet to pretend that His enemies refrained from doing so because He was a Rabbi, lest they should afford a handle of objection to the Gentiles, is palpably absurd, since they had no scruple in giving up this pretended Rabbi to be ignominiously executed by the Gentiles.

(3.) The name Rabbi was formerly a mere title of respect or civility; and it was only in the generation immediately preceding Christ that it *began* to have a technical meaning, applicable to the doctors of the schools^c. So that there is nothing strange if some persons should give to a man, with far greater powers than any of the Scribes possessed, a title, which was only then coming to be confined to them.

And lastly, how can the assertion, that Jesus was an ordained doctor, be reconciled with the fact that people wondered whence He got His learning^d? Is it credible,

^a John xi. 8, 16, 28, 48.

^b John xv. 20, xvi. 2.

^c Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* xxiii. 7; Vitringa, *lib. iii. pars 1. cap. 7.* With ourselves, the popular use of the word *doctor* is exactly similar.

^d Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 2; John vii. 15.

that in the synagogue or the temple, the Jews should have expressed this surprise, if it had been a well-known fact that He had passed through the schools?

No! let it be still the consolation of the poor, unlettered Christian, that in worldly circumstances his Master was such as he. And indeed, not only would this false opinion interfere with the especially and almost exclusively anti-Rabbinical character of Jesus, but our primary notions of the Gospel scheme would be most materially affected, if, instead of being a root out of a dry ground, He had been indebted to the paltry teaching of the Jewish schools for one jot of His knowledge*.

Having therefore established the truth, that Jesus publicly preached against every form of Rabbinism; and that He had no other declared purpose than to teach the same theory of justification as David and Isaiah had taught; it is at once evident that there is no ground

* What we have here arrived at, will be understood as applying only to Jesus and His original disciples. It is perhaps almost a matter of certainty that Saul, Barnabas, Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen were ordained Rabbis (Acts xiii. 1). It is probably true that the rulers of the synagogue, at the Pisidian Antioch, knew Paul and Barnabas to be such, when they sat down (Acts xiii. 14, 15). It may also be admitted that Paul was not excommunicated, for the reason stated above, namely because the Jews were loth to do so to a Rabbi, lest an occasion to cavil might be furnished to the Gentiles.

And if this reason be a genuine one, we may see why Jesus was delivered to the Gentiles, because He was not a Rabbi; while Paul's enemies were intent upon keeping him from them, because he *was* a Rabbi.

The Jews took Jesus to Pilate, but were grievously offended because Paul was taken to Felix.

For additional reasons that Jesus was not a Rabbi, see Neander's *Life of Jesus Christ*, book ii. chap. 1.

whatever for the notion, deeply affecting much of our popular theology, that He did away with what is improperly called legal justification, and the Covenant of Works (or a Divinely authorized declaration that men could be saved by external morality), and substituted a scheme, by which any man was received into favour with God through some inexplicable emotion of the feelings. He did indeed preach against the *illegal* covenant of works; He did oppose the doctrine of the Scribes, that virtue consisted in outward action; but, most assuredly, if the words attributed to Him by the Evangelists be correct, He did announce that *obedience* (not the legal, but the evangelical obedience) gave an entrance to His kingdom.

His death put a very important difference between the old and the new dispensations; not because God's mode of dealing with men was *changed*; but because men's knowledge, and the moral suasion which influenced them, were *augmented*. Of old, men were required to strive after God's truth, and to earnestly intend to obey it all, although practically they failed in particulars; and in this respect our relation towards God is precisely the same. To them was conveyed a comfortable assurance, more or less explicit, that at a future time, Jehovah would make some great display of mercy and power, whereby the failures and sins of sincere penitents would be atoned for. They did not know how this was to be accomplished, excepting that it was connected with the promised Messiah. We do know that the Son of God made the atonement, and are therefore

more readily convinced than they were, that God, who did so much, will do everything else^a. *They* were told that God would be reconciled; *we* can go to Him with full assurance that He has already been reconciled.

In this knowledge and assurance alone is our state superior to theirs. I do not here speak of the doctrines peculiar to the established kingdom of heaven, or of the bond of union, internal or external, among those who are Christ's disciples. But I do contend that, far from promulgating any new system of justification, Jesus most expressly recalled men's attention to the old faith of Israel, and inculcated that, with His church; that faith was to abide.

It was in consequence of these lessons that He incurred the persecution of the Jewish rulers. This faith, which He taught, was forgotten; the doctors fancied He was preaching against the Law, when in fact He was preaching against the false position in which they placed the Law, as showing the rule of individual righteousness.

The common opinion, which attributes the rejection of the Saviour primarily to His assumption of Divinity, has no sufficient ground to rest upon. The Rabbis, even after the spread of the Gospel, attributed many of the Divine qualities to their coming Messiah^b. The first

^a Rom. v. 1-10.

^b See Tholuck on the Romans, ix. 5, and Hengstenberg's *Christology*, *passim*.

Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. in Matt. xxi. 38), from a too literal interpretation of a parable, has the singular notion that the rulers knew Him to be the Christ. This opinion is not only highly improbable in itself, but is directly contradicted by what Peter says at Acts iii. 17.

cause of dispute was, "Does the Law speak of everlasting life? Has God authorized a covenant of works?" Our previous considerations have proved, that with this question the national pride was intimately concerned. The doctors decided that he, who robbed the Jew of a monopoly in God's favour, could not be the Christ; and that *therefore* his claiming of Divinity was blasphemy.

They began to oppose Him, under the impression that He was teaching men to forsake Moses; and they were not only baffled in their attempts to prove Him a violater of the Law, but were astonished at their own failures. They were vexed when they discovered that they could only prove Him a despiser of their interpretation of the Law. But having settled, as an axiomatic truth, that their interpretation was correct, though unable to convict Him by the Law; they lamented, it may be, the want of legal evidence, and nevertheless determined that He should die without it.

And how beautiful does the picture of the model man appear, under this aspect! Even His enemies, who had sworn His destruction, had, upon their own showing, no fault to find in Him. The most skilful straining of the Divine Law could not prove Him a violater of it. He died, because He opposed the false and novel doctrines of the Scribes; because He would have removed the rust which had gathered about the institutions of Moses. The Jews insisted that the rust should remain, until it corroded and destroyed what they thought it was protecting.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN JEWS.

IF the principles advocated in this book are true; if Judaism, properly understood, was never a mode of individual justification; we shall find the Apostles, in the first generation of the kingdom, observing their duties as strict Israelites, and at the same time under no apprehension that they were forgetting the Gospel. While, on the other hand, if the Law of Moses had been a spiritual religion until Jesus introduced Christianity (which is the common opinion); then we should assuredly read of the inspired disciples, who were guided into all necessary truth, shrinking from the old system, and declaring with one mouth, that the stock of Abraham were no longer to live as Jews.

The Acts of the Apostles and the canonical epistles, very far from countenancing this latter supposition, exhibit the chief of the Apostles almost falling off into the error of binding the Law of Moses upon the Gentiles. And, when themselves persuaded that Judaism was only for Jews, they could scarcely convince other Jewish Christians of the same truth. In the whole conduct of the Apostles, but especially of Paul, the all but universal opinion that they knew Judaism had ceased, and yet drew a distinction between Jewish and Gentile observance of it, does certainly represent them as guilty of

double dealing. Even professed admirers of Paul do not scruple to represent him as practising what he condemned in others ; and as vindicating himself, with every show of warmth, from a charge, which (if the common opinion were correct) he must have known was a true charge.

Now, in order to understand the whole conduct of the Apostles, we must take into account the peculiar position occupied by the Jewish nation during the period traced out in the inspired history. *They had broken their Covenant, but they were not yet ejected from the land. It was not known that the Covenant had terminated.* I am convinced that this remarkable truth will fully explain all that seems strange or inconsistent in the Jewish Christians. It was God's will that a whole generation should go by, before the loss of the Old Covenant was consummated and published. He did not, therefore, *reveal* to any one that the Jewish nation had ceased to be His peculiar people, until He announced it, in the clearest possible way, by destroying the Temple, and so rendering Judaism simply impossible ; and by utterly and literally chasing every circumcised man out of Palestine.

And this mode of revelation need not surprise us, for it is in strict analogy with God's usual government of mankind. We cannot look for a miraculous interference to declare God's judgements upon every sinner. In almost all cases the judgement is proclaimed by the continuing wickedness of the criminal at length returning upon his own head. In fact, the same fatal error that Judaism was of eternal obligation, which caused the

rejection of Jesus, aggravated in the course of another generation, led to the ferocious resistance to the Gentiles, and brought upon the Jews the vengeance of the whole Roman world.

When I say that the disciples of our Lord did not know that the Old Covenant was ended, I feel I am incurring some danger of being misunderstood, as though I was decrying their inspiration. But, unless we are disposed to look upon the Apostles as a kind of demigods, entitled to *λατρεία*; unless we set aside the plainest declarations, that they were *individually* mistaken in many things; we must look fairly and firmly upon the evident fact, that they did not generally understand how the rejection of Jesus had made Judaism a dead letter. Their inspiration amounted to this: whatever they gave forth as communications from God, were infallible; but God did not communicate *every truth* to them. He only revealed what was necessary at that time to be known. It was not essential to the spread of the Gospel, while the Temple stood, that they should see that Judaism had terminated; nay, until the Levitical service was pronounced impracticable, no Jew was allowed to free himself from the observance of it. While, at the same time, it would have interfered with the true idea of Christianity, if Judaism had continued to spread among the Gentiles; and hence they were inspired to decide, that it should not advance beyond those who were born of Israel.

Indeed nothing so surely establishes the fact that they were acting under Divine guidance, as the know-

ledge that in their authorized decisions they were carrying out God's purposes, without themselves distinctly perceiving what those purposes were. The separation between the Law and the Gospel perplexed many even of the Apostles ; while to us, who have witnessed the end of the Mosaic worship, the separation appears reasonable and clear. The first disciples had possession of their Master's prediction, that the Temple and city should be destroyed during the lifetime of some of them ; but there is no evidence that they connected this destruction with the cessation of the Jewish Covenant, any more than the modern Jews do. We, who are enlightened by the course of history, can see that our Saviour's words plainly pointed to the fall of the Temple as the consequence of the rejection of Him^a ; while it is beyond dispute, that they who heard the words were not at all certain of the exact mode in which they were to be fulfilled.

I pass over, at present, the cases of Stephen, Paul, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and proceed to consider the conduct and preaching of the original Apostles, represented by the three pillars, Peter, James, and John, of whom we possess original letters, in addition to the short notice given in Luke's history. And nothing appears more plain than that these Apostles did never teach the end of Judaism ; at least if we be allowed to take as testimony only what is recorded. Their palpable opinion was that both Covenants could co-exist. And so settled were they in this opinion, that

^a Compare Matt. xxiv. with the latter part of xxiii.

they were almost on the point of requiring not only Jews, but Gentiles also, to observe the two Covenants together. If, however, either of the views were true; first, that of the mistaken Christian, who looks upon Judaism as an old scheme of justification, abolished by the Gospel; or secondly, that of the neologist, who thinks that Christianity was a step beyond the Law, as his own philosophism is an advance from Christianity; is it not marvellous that these foremost Evangelists never say, "Jews! you used to observe Moses once, and then you were right; but the claims of Moses have ceased, and you are now to be Christians?"

There is no hint dropped that these men breathed a syllable of the kind. And their silence fully establishes the argument in hand, namely that *Judaism and Christianity could co-exist*. For had they imagined such a thing as one Divine Law taking the place of another; much more, if their very mission was to announce the change; they must have recurred to this idea at every turn of their preaching. But did Peter, when he spoke boldly on the day of Pentecost, or after the healing of the lame man, or in presence of the Sanhedrim, say that Jews were no longer to be Jews? Did he not imply, both by his words and his conduct, that christianized Jews were as much Israelites as those who disbelieved? And how could this have been, if he had understood Judaism and Christianity to be two antagonist principles of justification? Did he, or James, or John, in their Epistles, write that Judaism now was not what Judaism was formerly? And if not, how plain is it that they all,

though Peter appears most prominently in the history, supposed the Jewish Christians still to remain very Jews ! So little prepared were they for a cessation of the Law, that not only, in their question to their Master, had they connected the end of the world with the destruction of the Temple ^a, but even afterwards, in their Epistles, they seem to have retained the same impression ^b.

In their settlement of the service of the Church, they adhered closely to that of the Synagogue ; and their continuance of the Jewish ecclesiastical system was adopted, to a great extent, by the Gentile Christians, under the notion, that it was well for the uncircumcision to conform to all the arrangements they could, which were already in existence among their elder brethren, the Jews. And I repeat that this never could have been, if the circumcised Christians imagined that they were no longer Jews.

The conduct of the early Apostles fully testifies that, at first they supposed it necessary for a Gentile to become a Jew, before he could become a Christian ; while, along with this, they still held fast to what their Master had declared, that the Gospel was to be preached to every creature. When Cornelius sent for Peter, there is reason to believe that the apostle, had he been left to himself, would have required the centurion to be circumcised. It was in obedience to a heavenly vision that he consented to go to him. And even the authority of the foremost Christian, of him to whom the keys had been

^a Matt. xxiv. 3.

^b James v. 7, 8 ; 1 Peter iv. 7 ; 1 John ii. 28.

delivered, was not sufficient to convince the other disciples. When they called him to account for "going in to men uncircumcised, and eating with them," they were not satisfied of the correctness of his conduct, until his description of his own vision, and of the subsequent outpouring of the Holy Ghost, showed that God approved of the proceeding. And how is all this account to be reconciled with the pretence that the Apostles were preaching "The Law changed into the Gospel," when, in truth, they were disposed to adhere to a rigid, bigoted, and even mistaken regard to it?

The case of Cornelius was looked upon as an exception to the general rule. It is particularly mentioned that the dispersed Christians preached only to the Jews^a. It was not the design of God that the Gospel should be freely and universally offered to the Gentiles, until Israel had finally accepted or refused it; and as long as the Church consisted only of Israelites, there was no reason why the question of circumcising the former should be agitated. When the time came, a fit instrument for proclaiming God's will on this question was found in the Cilician Saul. But we must remember that these erroneous notions respecting the *limits* of Judaism, in no way interfered with the correctness of their opinion, that the Law was not a cause of justification. That would have been a *fatal* error, from which they were effectually guarded, as well by the recollection of their Master's teaching, that righteousness consisted not in any outward service, as by their inspiration in all *necessary*

^a Acts xi. 19, 20.

truths. While Peter was indulging in Rabbinical exclusiveness, he never imagined that distinction of meats would help a man to heaven. He was *preserved* from preaching any condition of God's favour, except faith and repentance.

When from these Jews of Palestine, we turn to the more liberal and better-instructed Grecian converts, we at once perceive a very decided contrast. These were much more enlightened on the connection of the two Covenants, than those who had first opened the kingdom of heaven to men. This is remarkably visible in the account of Stephen, who took so different a stand to what Peter and John had done, that immediately he was exposed to another and a fiercer kind of persecution than they had been. In the case of the Apostles, the rulers, however much they were filled with indignation, could neither prevail on the council to put them to death, nor rouse the feelings of the people against them; for they said nothing contrary to the Law. Stephen, from the very moment that he entered on his duties, encountered a determined resistance, ending in his judicial conviction and death. And there is no doubt whatever that the reason of this marked difference was, that he was the first who declared openly that the Jews had broken their Covenant, and that God would, in consequence, cause everything connected with the Covenant to cease. In short he was convicted, upon his own showing, of saying, "that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered *."

* Acts vi. 14.

Indeed, unless we understand his speech as tending to prove to the council that the nation had violated the terms upon which the Covenant was founded, and *therefore* they were to look for a change of customs; it is not perceptible how the speech is a defence at all to the charge, or in any way connected with the charge, or with the several parts of itself. But, instead of treating it as merely a collection of unmeaning quotations from Scripture, and ill-timed railing against his people, more befitting a giddy fanatic than one of irresistible spirit and wisdom; let us suppose him proving the words he had spoken to be true, and the speech is an entire argument from beginning to end; quite sufficient to rouse the indignation of his judges.

He commences by calling to their minds what the Old Covenant was; the covenant of circumcision; the conditional right of inheriting the land (vii. 2-8). He shows what means God adopted for fulfilling His part of the Covenant; that the settlement in Egypt, till the family had multiplied into a nation, and even the persecution which drove them out, were some of those means (vv. 9-36). He points out how the people had, from the beginning, manifested a disposition to infringe their terms, by objecting to Moses, by worshiping images and false gods; and how *for the latter offence*, God always threatened to put an end to the Covenant (vv. 35-43). He then continues, that the Temple service was not a part of spiritual religion, because not only did the nation exist from Moses to Solomon without the Temple,—with only an imperfect form of it, the Tabernacle; but,

says he, at no time does the Most High dwell in any temples made with hands, and He therefore can be worshipped spiritually without the Levitical service (vv. 44-50). And then, let it be observed how he concludes. He could not, with any show of truth, accuse those rulers who heard him, of rejecting Moses, or of making figures of Moloch and Remphan; and yet he says, "Ye have been the betrayers and murderers of the Just One; ye who have not kept the Law, received by the disposition of angels. *And in this ye do as your fathers did* (vv. 51-53)."

Does he not mean that the murder of Jesus was, like the setting-up of Moloch and Remphan, a rejection of Jehovah, and a violation of the Covenant? And he clearly would imply, (or he probably would have declared, if not interrupted,) that, in consequence of this violation, the Temple was to be destroyed, and the Mosaic customs were to cease.

I cannot but admire and reverence the prospective wisdom, which has thus recorded so valuable a testimony to the unity of the Scriptural design; intended for the instruction of us, rather than of those who listened to the words, and probably did not fully perceive their import. Nor is there anything which so unanswerably demonstrates the Divine guidance of the Scripture writers, as a record of this kind, revealing great truths, made plain by the course of the world's history. In those days there was no fear of Christians despising the Jewish books, as there was no need for men to be taught that Judaism was going to cease. But in our

own times, while one class of men delight to graft upon spiritual Christianity, doctrines which were not the fruit, but the rough husk which prepared and preserved it; and yet, with strange inconsistency, cast away all the really spiritual religion, peering forth from its unspiritual shell of Judaism;—while, on the other hand, pert scoffers would decry Christianity, and ridicule the Mosaic service, because they were not identical; refusing to taste the sweet kernel, because the unripe rind is bitter;—and while another maudlin set, eagerly seizing upon the false assumption, that the Gospel took the place of the Law, dream that their own follies are now to take the place of the Gospel;—how consoling is it to find, in this much-neglected speech of the Grecian deacon, a very plain reason alleged why Judaism was going to cease;—not for innovation sake, but because of the national rejection of the conditions upon which Judaism was founded; and an open declaration that Christianity was no new device, but the eternal counsel of God, always announced with sufficient distinctness to those who would attend!

It was the pleasure of God that Stephen should die. The first martyr preached a great truth, not yet to be fully and clearly apprehended, even by those who were working out the wonderful ways of the Lord. The time had not arrived for the perfect revelation that the Old Covenant was ready to vanish away. The first station in Christ's kingdom was to be finally scorned by those who had undergone a discipline of 1500 years, to pre-

pare them for it. The trial and execution of the Hellenist deacon were to rouse one of his judges to tread in his footsteps with greater success*.

How often does our Heavenly Father remove His servants, who, prophet-like, announce unheeded truths, and leave them for the instruction of coming generations! There are Abels and Stephens in all periods, who being dead, yet speak with deeper meaning, with more solemn persuasion, than they would have done had they lived! Their deaths glorify God!

The spirit of Stephen fell upon one young man, who, zealous for God's honour, and clinging, with the fondness of an ardent and sincere mind, to the customs which the New Way was to change, had consented unto the death of him who seemed to blaspheme Moses. God alone knows the struggle of mind in that impetuous Pharisee, who, listening to words which he could not resist but by stopping his ears, threw himself in a very energy of despair, into an active and maddened opposi-

* Our Saviour was a model for humanity in all respects, as a man and as a prophet. The need of a forerunner to Him is readily seen. But who understands that Stephen similarly preceded Paul, as Huss did Luther, to prepare the way and die before him? Many, in our own critical age, may be comforted, when they are preaching truths, with the thought that greater men than themselves shall hereafter not allow those truths to fall to the ground.

I feel considerable pleasure in discovering, since I wrote the above sketch of Stephen's preparing the way before Paul, that Dr. Neander is of opinion, that Stephen was more enlightened than the Apostles, and that he really preached the coming cessation of Judaism. I am disappointed that he does not perceive, in Stephen's speech, what was the reason for this cessation (History of the Planting of the Christian Church, book i. chap. 3).

tion to the fearful heresy*. The Grecian, when he died, prayed for Saul; and his prayer was heard; for the man who departed with a fiery spirit, breathing out threatenings and slaughter, was arrested by Jesus in the way, and sent to fill the place which Stephen had vacated. The disciple of Rabban Gamaliel was the more fitting instrument for carrying into all lands the truths, for preaching which he had judged the presumptuous Grecian to be worthy of death.

No man learns Christianity in a moment. The frank resolution of Saul, to preach the faith which once he destroyed, was overruled by Providence, and he spent many years in correcting his own Rabbinical prejudices, and preparing for his great work of a missionary to the Gentiles, as soon as the time arrived for turning away from the Jews. It was not until the Gospel had been fully preached in Jerusalem, Judæa and Samaria, and the Hellenist Jews, in the great cities of Syria and Asia Minor, were acquainted with it, that the kingdom was to be opened to Gentiles, *as their right*. Before this was fully accomplished, Saul was not required; but as soon as the danger appeared of Judaism being bound

* The expression in Acts ix. 5, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads," seems to refer to a painful effort of Paul to contend against urgent truth. Christianity must have been deficient in evidence, if the testimony of Stephen, the man of irresistible spirit and wisdom, failed in producing any effect upon a mind like Saul's.

We have seen, among ourselves, men of the same acute and logical turn, tremble before a train of reasoning which threatened to lead to infidelity; and, stopping their ears, like Saul, rush into the extreme of abject submission to sacerdotal authority. A want of ingenuousness on their part may have prevented the crisis which saved Paul.

upon Gentiles, this Pharisee, this Hebrew of Hebrews, this ancient persecutor of the Way, came from his retirement into the Gentile metropolis of the East, and brought all his Greek philosophy, his Rabbinical erudition, but chiefly his indomitable energy, his sincere love of truth, his clear understanding and sound judgment, to save Christianity from degenerating into a mere Galilean heresy, or a narrow impracticable dogma.

His opinion on the relation between the Law and the Gospel, during his first apostolical journey with Barnabas, can be easily seen from his discourse in the Synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch^a. His argument bears a

Stephen's speech, had upon him. Having uncision was (vv. 17 this Jewish covenant, Gospel; that, in fact, salvation, and by the (vv. 23-37); and then, ounces free forgiveness ould have been justified).

on the same truth, in eed: that the Levitical fication. But there is no he saw, so clearly as he ws and Gentiles were on , the Gospel. His course this time, he and all the

leading Christians thought that Israel was wholly to be converted, and *then* Gentiles would come into the kingdom. This was the plan originally traced out by the prophets and in the earlier discourses of Jesus; and until events showed that Israel was no longer the chosen people, the Apostles did not preach to any but their own nation. It was when Paul became convinced that the Jews *would* not take the first rank in the Church, that he turned to the Gentiles. The opposition he met with in the Pisidian Antioch was, apparently, the cause of his entering upon that sphere of labour to which he had been called.

In all the stations at which Paul and Barnabas stopped, in this journey, a similar course was followed; and Gentiles were acknowledged as Christians, no longer by way of exception, as in the case of Cornelius, but by way of right. At the great Antioch in Syria, the second city of the empire, the Gentile church was numerous and increasing*, and the Apostles were glad when they heard of it. But there was a party which, assenting to historical Christianity, had not abandoned the Rabbinical interpretation of Judaism. Some of them came to Antioch, and unsettled the minds of the converts there, by teaching that circumcision was necessary to salvation. At this point Paul seems to have perceived the immense im-

* It has been often repeated that the disciples were first called Christians in the Gentile Antioch. I am not aware that any one has noticed that it was not till Gentiles became disciples, that there was any necessity of having a distinctive name. The Jewish disciples were still so much Jews that they did not suppose themselves to be a separate sect.

portance attaching to the circumcision of a single Gentile. The truth now came distinctly before him, that if a Greek, like Titus, were circumcised, a principle would be established which would subvert the Gospel of Christ. If so dangerous an accident were to come upon the faith, that Gentiles were to become Jews *in order* that they might become Christians, the inevitable consequence would be, a return to the traditionary mode of justification, which the Lord had disproved and condemned.

And for this reason: If Judaism were bound upon Gentiles, it must have been in forgetfulness of the truth, that, concerning the possession of one land, and expressed outwardly in the service of one sanctuary, it was, under this aspect, of only partial obligation. If it were universal, this temporal covenant and this confined worship were impossible. It must have risen into the covenant of works, which ancient and modern Traditionaries, in spite of Moses, of Jesus, and of Paul, have supposed it to be.

Paul's resolution was now taken, that he would thenceforth live and die, in combating for the truth that the Law of Moses was not obligatory on any but the Jews. He would not make the slightest concession on this point, as he plainly saw the question must be set at rest for ever. He made his stand on the case of Titus; and with prudence equal to his courage, he called upon the Jerusalem apostles and elders to bear him out in his determination.

There is nothing so important recorded in the history, as the decision of the synod, convened for the purpose

of considering the question, Shall the Gentiles be bound by the Law of Moses? It is usual, among some modern commentators, to undervalue the authority of this synod; but it appears to me to have been the formal and deliberative expression of opinion of the united church, that Paul's view of the Gospel was correct. And its importance is so great, that without it, those Jewish Christians, who were afterwards called Ebionites, and who dissented from this decision, would not have been so manifestly in the wrong as they were proved to be. Peter first declared the conversion of Cornelius, in order to show that God did not refuse Gentiles merely because they were uncircumcised. He then called to their minds that the burden of seeking justification from the Law of Moses was intolerable; and that therefore the believing Gentiles were to be saved even as they and their fathers; not by a covenant of works, which Gentile Judaism was sure to grow into, but through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ*. The assembly, in consequence, gave their judgment that they entirely freed the Gentiles from the Mosaic Law; but, at the same time, while it was true that

* I have adopted the sense given to Acts xv. 11 by Wolfius, who refers "even as they," not to the Gentiles, but to the patriarchs, which seems to be the more probable meaning; because it supplies a proper reason why the Gentiles ought not to be taught to look to the Law for justification, viz. because neither ancient nor modern Jews did so. It would be a poor reason to say, that Gentiles are not to be saved by the Law, *because* they are to be saved by the Gospel.

There are some, even the most decided advocates of a Divinely authorized covenant of works, who see this meaning in the words; and yet, strangely enough, do not see the incongruity of *also* supposing the Law to have been proposed "for eternal life." (Witsii Œcon. Fœd. lib. iii. cap. 2. § 35.)

the converts from the heathen need not be *legal*, it was no less true that they must be *moral*. And they pointed to the "seven precepts" usually bound upon Gentiles, living in intercourse with Jews, as a well-known standard of morality*.

It is very plain that this judgement did not pretend to impose any *new* law upon either Jews or Gentiles. It was an announcement from those, who were to be preserved from fatal errors, that the uncircumcision were to have no other rule of justification than the one which God had always proposed to the whole of mankind.

There was no question raised about the observance of the Mosaic Law by Jews; and therefore, after this council, we do not find the Jewish Christians altering their mode of life. But Peter, and some others, even Barna-

* See Chap. III. of this work, at page 91. I cannot believe in the correctness of the usual interpretation given to the reason which was alleged to influence their decision: "For Moses of old time hath, in every city, them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day;" as though the Gentiles were to observe the necessary things mentioned, lest they should give offence to Jewish prejudice. For although some of the injunctions might be based upon mere love of quiet, is it conceivable that *πρὸς* was considered as only inexpedient?

There is another sense given to the passage (I think, by Chrysostom), that it amounts to an opinion that they need not legislate for Jews, because Jews knew the Law; but, unfortunately for this sense, there was no question raised about the Jews; and the sentence gives the reason for their legislating for Gentiles.

The truth seems to my own mind, upon a careful consideration of the whole subject, that the alleged reason (xv. 21) was for the *entire* decision, not for specifying the "necessary things:" and implies that the Law of Moses, being everywhere well known, would authorise their views, and would vindicate itself from being distorted into a covenant of works.

bas, one of the most liberal of the circumcision, without mistaking the true purport of Judaism, acted disingenuously in refusing to eat with Gentiles; no doubt from a feeling that it was expedient to conciliate the Jews^a. And upon this occasion, Paul rebuked his brother apostle with considerable warmth: "If thou," he said, "being a Jew, live with Gentiles, without ceasing to be a Jew, as with brothers; why shouldest thou now compel Gentiles to live with Jews, as if they were not brothers? Even Jews depend on Christ for justification; why should Gentiles be taught to depend upon the Law^b?" Paul stood firm upon this point, and saved, at the same time, the church from schism, and the Law from misinterpretation.

I find no ground whatever for the almost universal opinion, that Paul himself either abandoned his observance of the Law, or adhered to it merely when it was convenient or expedient to do so. For not only did he, during his last visit to Jerusalem, defend himself from a charge of despising Moses, but he challenged his enemies to prove that the charge had any foundation. And this he did, with an earnest warmth and indignation, that no honest man, if he had really lived at any time an anti-Jewish

^a The *hypocrisy* which Paul attributes to Peter and the others (Gal. ii. 13), was the sense of a false expediency, urging them to act against what they had acknowledged to be right.

^b Gal. ii. 14. It is utterly improbable, and is contradicted by every testimony, that Peter living *ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς*, ceased from his Judaism. What Paul means is evidently this: that if Peter would eat and converse with Gentiles, why should he, by his conduct, compel the Gentiles to cease from eating and conversing with Jews, unless they *Judaized*?

life, could have displayed. In fact, if Paul ever, for a single moment, abandoned a strict compliance with the Mosaic Law, his defence before the Sanhedrim was a lie.

And, in order that no doubt whatever may exist as to this truth, viz. that Paul was as rigid a Jew as Peter, and a more *lawful* Jew than his enemies, it will be only necessary to refer to his proceeding with respect to Timothy, which, being entirely misunderstood, is supposed to prove that Paul sometimes did, and sometimes did not, observe the Jewish ceremonial Law ; and which would also prove (if the common view were correct) that Paul was a dishonest man. And even waiving for the present this consequence, which, however, cannot be got rid of, is it in any way conceivable that so determined and impetuous a man as Paul could be frightened into an action which would reverse all he had striven to accomplish ? And although some persons may so mistake Paul's character, as to suppose it possible for him to give up the earnest conviction of his own mind, on a subject of importance, supported by the deliberate judgement of the assembled apostles, in order to gratify any man's prejudice ; yet, let me ask, where was the expediency in the case of Timothy, which did not more manifestly appear in the case of Titus ? So far as the account goes, both in the Acts of the Apostles and in his own Epistles, there was a much greater clamour raised on the first than on the second question. And had he allowed expediency to supersede exact right, there is no doubt that the circumcision of Titus would have brought many Jews into the church ; who would not become Christians, be-

cause Gentiles were admitted to the same privileges as themselves : at any rate, a very disastrous dispute would have been avoided.

The injustice of charging Paul with expediency is sometimes smoothed off by supposing that he circumcised Timothy, because he required his assistance in his ministrations among the Jews, who refused to listen to one uncircumcised*. But would not this have been acting with an expediency, not more needful than in the case of Titus? And indeed it does not seem to strike commentators, that he circumcised Timothy, just at the time when he was turning almost exclusively to the Gentiles; and therefore the reason could not have been that he required Timothy to preach to the Jews; which office there is no evidence to show that this disciple exercised. In what way, also, can his sharp rebuke of Peter, for withdrawing from Gentiles under this very sense of expediency, be reconciled with the character of an honest man, if he acted precisely from the same expediency in the case of Timothy? Or, how can we avoid, upon this supposition, accusing Paul of fickle heedlessness, if he excited a hot controversy at Antioch and Jerusalem, al-

* It must only proceed from a want of due reflection, that Paul can be understood (1 Cor. ix. 20) to say, that he was a Jew for quiet's sake. For I again ask, what becomes of his defence before the Sanhedrim, if among Gentiles he also became a Gentile, for quiet's sake? Or, is he to be literally understood as though he asserted, that, when it suited his convenience, he became also lawless and weak? It is not to be doubted that he means this: "When I have people of a particular order of mind to contend with, I use arguments and illustrations adapted to their wants." Compare his Sermon in the Synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch, with his Address to the Heathens of Lystra.

most producing a schism ; and immediately afterwards yielded up his point at Derbe and Lystra, rendering the decree which had cost so much trouble, a dead letter ?

No one seems to have understood that, the one disciple being a Gentile, and the other a Jew, Paul was acting fully as resolute and consistent a part in circumcising the second, as in refusing to circumcise the first. The relation given in the Acts of the Apostles, compared with the Second Epistle to Timothy, puts beyond all doubt that this young convert had been brought up as a Jew, and had always considered himself as such ; while, from having had a Greek father, he had not been circumcised. This is to be gathered from the fact, that whereas in both passages^a his mother is mentioned as a Jewess, yet his Gentile father is only noticed incidentally, as it were, to account for his not having *yet* been circumcised. Joining this with St. Paul's declaration that he had known the Holy Scriptures *from a child*^b, it seems indisputable that he had been educated by his mother as a Jew ; while his Greek father had only been able to keep him from circumcision, and was now, most probably, dead. When Paul found him, he insisted on his being circumcised, for he had no right to live as a Jew, unless he submitted to this initiatory rite. And this he did, "because of the Jews which were in those quarters, for they knew all that his father was a Greek." Not for fear of the Jews, but to convince them how firm and consistent his own conduct was, in obliging one, who lived as a Jew, and was

^a Acts xvi. 1, & 2 Tim. i. 5.

^b 2 Tim. iii. 15.

known not to have been duly made a Jew, to be circumcised.

The whole proceeding signified that Jews were bound by the Old Covenant ; but Gentiles were not. And that the Old Covenant was not immediately concerned with any one's salvation.

The Epistle to the Galatians throws great light upon the transaction. The first two chapters are occupied with explaining St. Paul's conduct with regard to Titus ; and it will be observed, that the reason he gives for not circumcising him, was that he was a Greek ; implying that had he been a Jew, like Timothy, he should not have acted as he did. In the third chapter, he points out that the Law never was a mode of justification, because it had been given, subsequently to the promise of the (Christian) covenant, made to Abraham, and because the father of the faithful was justified, before he was circumcised (iii. 5-18). And, to prevent the question "wherefore then serveth the Law?" if it could not give salvation ; he shows that it was added "because of transgressions," in order to weed out everything in the world antagonistic to the Gospel, and it was therefore a *pædagog*ue to Christ* (vv. 19-25).


In concluding this part of his argument, he declares his conviction, that Jews observing the whole Law, and Gentiles observing none of it, were all on the same footing with regard to God's favour. Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female, were all to put on Christ (v. 28). He no more means that a Jew was to become

* See Chap. III. of this Book, at page 73.

a Greek, when he embraced the Gospel, than that a male was to become a female ; but that the Gospel could be equally embraced by both ; in other words, that Christianity did not necessarily destroy the difference previously existing between the circumcision and the uncircumcision.

He allegorises in the fourth chapter : he says that Christianity was as much superior to Judaism, as Sarah was to Agar, or Sion to Sinai. It is scarcely necessary to point out that he does not mean to say that Judaism *really* came from Agar, and Christianity from Sarah ; because such was not true. The whole contrast is in the form of an allegory, and therefore must not be taken literally. His meaning however plainly is, that if the Jews put the Law *into the place* of the Gospel, they were like Ishmael persecuting Isaac ; they were arrogating for Judaism a position it was never intended to occupy. The son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman ; nor shall temporal Judaism be *on the same footing* with eternal Christianity.

In the fifth chapter, while he urges the Gentiles to remember in what they were like the son of the freewoman, he testifies to them (the Gentiles) that if they were circumcised, they would admit that the Law promised salvation ; and then Christ would profit them nothing. He does not mean that Christ would not profit circumcised Jews, who rightly understood circumcision ; for, not only was he circumcised himself, and had just insisted upon Timothy undergoing that rite ; but he ad-



mits that he preached circumcision*, and that he ought not to suffer persecution on that account; for *his* preaching of it fulfilled the Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The Apostle's argument evidently is that, if circumcision were understood as he preached it, Jews would continue to be Jews, and yet be at peace with Gentiles, who continued to be Gentiles.

And for this sole and sufficient reason. Judaism, as declared and practised by Paul, was no antagonistic principle to Christianity; but the Gospel and the Law were compatible with each other. In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working by love, in a new creature, whether Jew or Greek^b.

It was probably not long after he wrote the Galatian letter, that he was induced to address the longer and more elaborate Epistle to the Romans; in several places of which he touches on the same ground he had formerly gone over in his hastier composition sent to the Galatians; and although his style of argument is altered, we still find the same principle contended for, namely that Judaism never had been a law of justification. It is

* *Εἰ κηρύσσω. If I preach; granting that I preach.* There is no evidence that this was a groundless charge against him. He did preach circumcision when he circumcised Timothy.

^b Gal. v. 6, & vi. 15. The greater number of errors, in the interpretation of Scripture, are due to that Rabbinical method of weighing single texts as containing some mystic truth. It is to rush upon certain mistake, to look upon Paul's logical and consequent arguments, in the light of the Sibylline oracles; one scattered leaf being disjoined from that lying next it.

with chapters 9-11 that we are concerned; for in these only does he directly treat of Jewish matters. Indeed it has been remarked that these three chapters might well form an epistle by themselves, so complete is the subject handled in them.

His great regret is that all Israel had not embraced the Gospel; and, in order to show that there was nothing in this at variance with truth, he proves that God did not always give blessings to those who were born with a right to the blessings. It was not merely the being Abraham's offspring which gave the title, for there were some of his descendants not included in Israel. And as out of Abraham's and Isaac's sons, only one inherited the blessings, so only part of the Jews became Christians. He also declares that there were sufficient intimations in the Prophets that some of Israel should not enter the kingdom*. And the pains he takes in order to establish

* Rom. ix. 15, 27, 29; x. 16, 19, 21. There is a curious circumstance connected with the Roman Christians, that gives the reason why St. Paul should so much insist *to them*, that the Jews now had no greater spiritual rank than the Gentiles. Claudius had banished all Jews from Rome, including Jewish Christians (Acts xviii. 2). And the church, in that city, must have been probably the only church consisting of none but Gentiles. Before the Epistle to the Romans was written, the Jewish Christians had returned to their native city; for Priscilla and Aquila were there (Rom. xvi. 3). If the Jews found themselves no longer occupying the chief places in this church, as very probably they did in all others (Rom. xv. 27), we can easily conceive what heart-burnings must have been caused, and how necessary it was that the relation between Jew and Gentile should be carefully laid down.

I cannot appreciate the arguments of those who seek to prove that the Roman Church was composed of Gentiles only. If it had been, why should chapters ix-xi. have been written, with so much care and

this point, fully demonstrates that his main object was to ward off the difficulty that seemed to hang over the Gospel, from its not being embraced by the majority of the holy nation.

He then proceeds to show why the Jews did not accept the offered terms ; because they had mistaken the nature of individual righteousness. The unbelieving Jews were ignorant of God's righteousness, and went about to establish their own. The Law, *in the matter of justification*, could do nothing but point towards Christ (ix. 30 to x. 4). Such righteousness as Moses describes is of another kind, and did not concern eternal life, but life connected with the old temporal Covenant. Whereas the Christian doctrine of justification by faith might be gathered, *by implication*, even from the Law, which taught that God was always present in the hearts of believers, to guide them to faith and love (x. 5-11).

The Apostle's object in the eleventh chapter is to show that Gentiles, now occupying the position which Jews ought to have occupied, must take care lest they also fall away as the Jews did ; and he holds out hopes to the latter that, *if they choose*, they may regain their privileges*. The rejection of Israel which he is speaking

deliberation ; especially when it appears that the Apostle is fearful of offending some ? Why should he be so loth to declare the rejection of Israel to the Gentiles ? His tone is that of one who was speaking a sad truth, disagreeable not only to himself, but to those whom he was addressing.

* Without making any attempt to clear up the difficulties connected with the illustrations which St. Paul employs, it is beyond dispute that his *general design*, both here and in other places whence predestination to life eternal is gathered, is not to establish such a doctrine. And

of, is evidently rejection from the *Gospel*; for the Gentiles are said to have gained what the Jews lost; and of course the Gentiles were not admitted to the Mosaic Covenant. And for the same reason, the restoration he is here speaking of is to something enjoyed by the Gentiles; not the ancient theocratic state; for it does not appear that St. Paul was contemplating any change in *temporal* Judaism.

I trust it will be clearly understood what our position is; viz. that Paul's whole conduct and language testify his earnest conviction that Judaism had no claim upon Gentiles; but that Jews were still obliged, *for conscience sake*, to remain strict Jews, while they professed the Gospel. If this position is admitted, of course Paul thought that Judaism never was concerned with indivi-

how strange it is, that in preaching a fundamental truth, it should only come forth by stealth (as it were), out of an example or an allegory! But in this place, St. Paul *cannot* be speaking of any irrevocable predestination; for,

1st. His chief example of Jacob and Esau has nothing to do with such a doctrine; the book of Genesis represents Esau as the more prosperous man: it was Jacob who was a wanderer and an exile. The prophet Malachi, from whom he quotes, is speaking of the *nations* of Edom and Israel.

2ndly. If a Calvinist were to write of arbitrary election, and had to answer the question, "Wherefore hath Israel not attained unto righteousness?" he would never say, "Because they sought it not properly;" but, "because they were not elected." Therefore St. Paul was not writing, either about Calvinism, or as a Calvinist would write.

3rdly. The reprobation of Israel, and the election of the Gentiles, were not *irreversible*. For while he distinctly declares that there was no mistake about the grafting in, he yet intimates that they *may be* broken off. While Israel *may be* grafted in, although now broken off. Nor does he speak of an *arbitrary* election or reprobation; for he specifies conditions (xi. 20, 22, 23).

dual justification or eternal life. If he had, then he could not have been, at the same time, a zealous Jew and an earnest Christian ; both which he evidently was.

Now the only escape from this conclusion appears to some persons to be, in supposing Paul to have observed Judaism, not for conscience, but for expediency sake. And I do not hesitate to call this an unworthy and a false accusation. I have shown that nothing in Paul's life justifies the charge. And this will appear more plainly, if we consider the circumstances attending his last visit to Jerusalem ; when he was put upon his trial for the very thing which Christian commentators attribute to him ; viz. that sometimes he did not observe the Jewish Law.

We have seen that he *did* teach that Jews and Gentiles were to associate together, and that Gentiles were to be admitted as Christians, without being obliged first to be Jews. His enemies however misunderstood him, and represented Paul as teaching that the Jews ought to forsake Moses, that they ought not to circumcise their children, nor walk after the customs. And if Paul acted as the common view makes him act, the charge would have been a true one ; and his defence against it would have been a wilful deception.

But now mark ! When he arrived at Jerusalem, whither he had made haste to come, in order to keep the feast of Pentecost, like any other conscientious Jew^a, his brother apostles report to him this slander, and advise him to do something that will prove it to be a slander. In accord-

^a Acts xx. 16. Compare Acts xviii. 18 & 21.

ance with this advice, Paul undertook to provide the sacrifices for four poor Nazarites ; which seems to have been considered as a deed of great piety, and strongly indicative of zeal for the Law ^a.

If then it were true that Paul, in his obedience to the Jewish ceremonies, was acting only for the sake of expediency ; if he had not been a sincere observer of every part of the Law, this action would have been dishonest. For the intention of it was certainly to persuade the Jews that he was a strict follower of Moses. And it is worth noting, that when the Apostles informed Paul of the report, that he taught *the Jews* to despise the Law (which they imply would have been a very serious charge, but they did not themselves believe it), they were also careful to declare, that for what Paul really did teach, namely the freedom of *Gentiles* from the Law of Moses, they had already passed a decree, and were now ready to abide by it, and so sanction their brother's conduct ^b.

When Paul therefore, with an ingenuous feeling, presented himself in the Temple, for the purpose of satisfying these reasonable scruples, and of removing, if possible, all false impressions from the minds of the Jews, his enemies rushed upon him, with the outcry that he was profaning the Temple by bringing Gentiles within it. This charge was not true. He had, in full accordance with his principles, walked publicly about the city with Gentiles (which however, let it be observed, if he were acting merely for quiet's sake, he would not have done), because that was lawful ; but he had never brought them

^a Acts xxi. 17-26.

^b Acts xxi. 20-25.

within the sacred precincts, because that would have been unlawful^a.

The council, which was assembled to try him, professedly according to the Law, could prove nothing against him. And when he was able to obtain a hearing from them, under the protection of the Roman procurator, how decidedly and energetically did he repudiate the charge, and insist that his enemies could not prove it! And it is worthy of notice, that Felix acknowledged Paul's innocence, by refusing to give him up^b.

Festus, who succeeded Felix, seems to have proceeded with considerable fairness in the matter. He knew that Paul was accused of breaking the Law; and, so far as he was himself capable of judging, the prisoner successfully refuted the accusation. But, being new in the government, and mistrusting his own acquaintance with the technicalities of the native jurisprudence, he would have received the assistance of the lawyers at Jerusalem, promising his protection to Paul, if he would stand his trial in the national metropolis. But the Apostle of the Gentiles, whose resolute adherence to principle never degenerated into headlong enthusiasm, and whose courageous faith was compatible with prudence and even with caution, knew that the object of his enemies was to assassinate, not to try him. He therefore refused to quit Cæsarea, and claimed the right of not being delivered up to the Jews, *until they had proved* that he had broken the laws of his country. I know not anything more spirited than his petition of rights:—"I stand at

^a Acts xxi. 26-30.

^b Acts xxiv.

Cæsar's judgement-seat, where I ought to be judged; to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but, if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them; I appeal unto Cæsar^a."

Festus does not seem to have been convinced either of Paul's innocence or of his guilt, and referred the cause to the Jewish prince Agrippa, who, he knew, was much more likely to understand such questions than he was himself. And Agrippa decided that Paul was guiltless, and might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed unto Cæsar. That is, Festus, with the advice of the king, would have released the Apostle, but Paul insisted on being tried at the law courts in Rome; for he was not content with the expression of a private opinion of his blamelessness, whether coming from the cautious Agrippa or the embarrassed Festus, but demanded a legal acquittal, in due form, of the things laid to his charge, which Festus, for fear of the Jews, was not prepared to grant him^b.

And yet commentators, with one accord, think that Paul was playing a double part, and shuffling out of the charge by blinding the Jewish elders and menacing the Roman magistrate. Let the world decide how untrue is the accusation first brought against him by a bigoted mob, "that he felt himself at liberty to observe or to omit the rites of Moses," which, though repudiated by himself and overruled by his judges, is yet laid upon him

^a Acts xxv.

^b Acts xxvi.

by those, who, with doctrinal prejudices strangely obscuring their perceptions of right and wrong, praise the Apostle for what he shrunk from with horror.

Paul saw that Judaism was not for Gentiles; while his whole conduct proves how determined he was to bind it upon Israel. But here another very important question arises, which we cannot so easily answer. Did he know that Judaism was *going* to cease? It is indeed supposable that he may have known this, and yet, as long as it had not actually ceased, he may have thought that Jews were not released from its control. I cannot however imagine how, if he knew it certainly, he could have shown such resolute zeal in defending Judaism. And herein we at once perceive the wisdom of God, in not distinctly revealing this truth, during the period that the energy and activity of the Jewish apostles were required. Moreover, in all his undisputed writings, he does not allude to an expectation of a change of customs, even when he quotes parts of old prophecies, which intimate that Judaism was not eternal^a; or follows up a line of argument which might have led him to more than a suspicion of the truth^b.

^a Rom. xi. 27.

^b Rom. ix-xi. I have before noticed (at page 267) that in these three chapters of the Romans, the Apostle is speaking of the Jewish nation not embracing *the Gospel*. And it is, I repeat, remarkable that Paul did not follow up this line of argument a little further, and lay down the same consequence as Stephen and the author of the Hebrews did, that the change of customs was the fruit of the rejection of the Gospel.

In Rom. vii. 6, our English translation, "that being dead," goes upon the supposition that the true reading is ἀποθανόντος; whereas,

When now we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we find a most important difference between the views of the writer and those of Paul; a difference which proves that either this Epistle was not written by Paul, or at a much later date than his other works. For it is intelligibly laid down that Judaism was going to cease. And it is certain that Paul, even if he was aware of this, carefully abstained from declaring it, and acted as though he knew it not. As soon as we are convinced that the Apostle of the Gentiles could not have done the immense good which he did, if his energy had been crippled and his reasoning perplexed, by perceiving the crumbling to pieces of the Old Israelite Covenant, we also under-

not only is the weight of authority on the side of the reading ἀποθανόντες, but indeed the argument itself requires this reading. "We being dead (viz. by sharing Christ's death) to that Law, which, without that death, would have condemned us." But even if we were to read ἀποθανόντος, our position (that Paul does not speak of the end of Judaism) would not be affected. For the Law, in this passage, is manifestly not the Jewish Law, but the law of eternal equity (vi. 14 & vii. 4). He could not have said with truth that the Mosaic Law *was* dead.

The only apparent exception which opposes this position is at Gal. iii. 23-25, where the Apostle certainly means that Judaism had answered its end, when it had introduced the world to Christianity. Yet I cannot believe Paul to mean that Jews were no longer to be Jews, for everything else which he said or did is against such a meaning. He is very probably only speaking of the effect of Judaism upon Gentiles, which is the subject of the Epistle. It seems to my mind that if Paul had intended a termination of Judaism, he never could have said "there is neither Jew nor Greek," for there would have been Greek only. It is worth observation, that the Apostle, in his discourse at the Pisidian Antioch, follows Stephen's argument, except in charging the Jews with having violated the Covenant, and in predicting a change of customs.

stand why Stephen, who truly foresaw this coming change of customs, was not fit for such work ; and why the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with more theoretical enlightenment than Paul, should apparently have exercised but little influence in the advancement of the Gospel.

Paul contended that the Old Covenant was *temporal* ; he who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews saw that it was *temporary* also. And indeed the whole import of this Epistle can only be understood, if we suppose it written in order to prevent any false conclusions on the minds of the Jewish Christians, at a time when it was becoming highly probable that the days of the Mosaic ritual were numbered. The first seven chapters are taken up with proving that during the existence of Judaism, Christianity was always implied. And then in the eighth chapter, the real subject is apparent^a ; to persuade the Hebrew Christians not to be troubled by any apprehension when Judaism should cease ; for, from the first, it had been clearly announced that the Old Covenant was only to remain while unviolated by Israel. "If that first Covenant had been *blameless*^b, then no place

^a This placing of the main subject of the Epistle near its middle, has a Pauline aspect. But the arguments for Paul's authorship are so trifling, compared with those against it, that it seems wonderful how any one can doubt. Whatever uncertainty was once in my mind, entirely vanished when I read Tholuck's valuable remarks in his introduction to this Epistle.

If Apollos was not the author, of a surety it must have been some one precisely in his circumstances, who is not mentioned in the New Testament.

^b ἀμεμπτος (Heb. viii. 7). Of course this is the meaning. The

should have been found for the second." That is, if it had not been foreseen that *the observance* of the Jewish Covenant would be faulty, Jeremiah would never have distinguished the first and the second as old and new. Because, if the Jewish Covenant, which all Christians know is thus contrasted with the Evangelical, is called Old; it is implied that it is "ready to vanish away." This idea also is repeated at the end of the twelfth chapter, viz. that since Judaism was shaken and going to fall, we must hold to the kingdom that cannot be moved^a.

The test of orthodoxy, during the Jewish period of the church, that is, till the destruction of the Temple, was evidently how the Mosaic Law was to be interpreted. All the Apostles, and those who adhered to them, repudiated the notion of seeking individual justification from it. The Jewish Christians, unanimously, whether following Peter or James, or inclining to Paul, understood the two covenants to be compatible the one with

English word *faultless* is ambiguous, and might mean *imperfect*. But the Greek word is *unblameable*. The writer could not charge a covenant made by God, with *blameworthiness*:—it is the observance he says was faulty; "for finding fault (not with the Covenant, but) with them," &c.

^a And yet a clear-sighted writer, who certainly cannot be accused of leaning to traditional interpretations, has said, "The Hebrew Christians were told in this Epistle, that the Old Covenant *had passed away*, that a new one *had taken its place*" (Maurice's Third Lecture on the Hebrews, p. 92). If he will look into the Epistle, he will see that the Hebrew Christians were told that the Jewish Covenant was *ready to vanish away*, while the Evangelical nevertheless would *abide*. The object being to prevent any fear arising in the minds of the Christians of Palestine in consequence; inasmuch as the New Covenant was, in substance, the same as had always existed, even during the most flourishing periods of the old.

the other, and did not imagine that their Christianity interfered with their Judaism. There was however considerable diversity of opinion with regard to the liberty of intercourse between the circumcised and the uncircumcised. And this diversity only, not any variance on the question of justification, made two parties, that of James, and that of Paul. Few distinctly perceived that Judaism was about to pass away; the speech of Stephen and the Epistle to the Hebrews alone making allusion to such an expectation. And no one but the protomartyr had sufficient certainty on the subject, as to announce openly that it was the rejection of Jesus which had vitiated the Old Covenant.

There was another party again, which hated Paul, and made the name of James a pretence; embracing historical Christianity, but cleaving to the Rabbinical justification by the Law. The decree of the Synod was leveled against these, and thenceforward they became schismatics. In principle they were but little different from the infidel Jews; for although they regarded Jesus of Nazareth as Christ and Saviour, yet so long as they made the Mosaic Law binding upon those who could not inherit the land, they must have distorted that Law to the same extent as those who blasphemed the Lord. But it is very curious that the only persons who represented Christianity as professing to *take the place* of Judaism, were those who rejected the whole scheme of the Nazarenes, historical as well as dogmatical. We know that this is still the great objection the modern Jews have to the Gospel; for they consider that it is the height of

impiety and absurdity to think of God as changing His mind^a, as the common language of Christians does unquestionably represent Him. No means can ever be adopted to convince them that Jesus is Jehovah, until they are taught that He and His first disciples upheld Jehovah's Law; and that they do themselves represent God as changing His mind, in first swearing by Himself to retain them in the land so long as they should not reject Him, and now barring Canaan against them for eighteen hundred years, when they do not know how or when they have forsaken the Lord who brought them out of Egypt.

The entire destruction of the city and Temple must have opened the eyes of many to the fact, that the Old Covenant was at an end. That event was the certain revelation that Jerusalem was the carcase round which the eagles had gathered. There could now be no doubt, that Israel after the flesh was no longer the Israel of God. And yet some, we may well believe, did not see this; for God's revelations never carry universal persuasion.

Many there were, true Christians, who could not so easily abandon a system hallowed by the recollection of fifteen centuries, and who seem to have continued an

^a Maimonides denies the resurrection to "those who say that the Creator has changed one law for another, or that the Law has now ceased, although divinely given" (*Canones Pœnitentiæ*, cap. iii.). He plainly is referring to Christianity; and if Christians did say so then (which many do now), the Rabbi was justified in an *à priori* objection to a system of doctrines which robbed God of unchangeableness, His most necessary attribute.

observance of the Mosaic Law, even when that observance properly was impossible, without incurring any guilt, and with the indulgence of their fellow-Christians^a. These are known in history by the name of Nazarenes. Various causes dissipated this sect. The increasing conviction that Judaism, regarded as temporal, had lost its sanctions and its symbols ; the general wish of all Christians to separate from the bloody fanatics who were hated by the whole world ; the great persecution raised by Bar Cochab against all who denied the eternal authority of the Law ; and, still more effectually, the punishments inflicted by Hadrian on all who called themselves Jews^b ; must have convinced mankind, that it was not

^a Justin Martyr makes a great distinction between two classes of Jewish Christians : "Those who are willing to trust in the same Christ and to observe the everlasting and natural precepts of piety, and choose to associate with Christians and faithful men, not persuading them to be circumcised like them, or to *sabbatize*, or to keep any such things, ought to be received as brothers ;" while "those who, professing to believe in the same Christ, compel Gentile Christians to live according to the institutions of Moses, are not to be similarly received" (Dialog. cum Tryphone, cap. 47). See Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, § 32 & 43, where the authorities for the above statements are specified.

^b Under Hadrian, circumcision was forbidden. This decree excited the rebellion of Bar Cochab, who put to death all who renounced Judaism. When this rebellion was crushed, "580,000 men were slain in the assaults and fights ; but of those who perished by hunger, disease and fire, the multitude cannot be investigated. So that almost all Judæa was left desert" (Dio Cassius, lib. xlix. cap. 14). The Jews were forbidden, under pain of death, to return to Jerusalem, where however a Gentile church was established : and we may easily conceive how strong an inducement there must have been to the milder Nazarenes to join themselves to this church (see Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, § 39-43).



the will of God that Judaism and Christianity should now co-exist. We soon lose sight of these orthodox Christian Jews altogether.

But there were others, true descendants of Paul's enemies, who clung to the notion that the Levitical Law gave a title to eternal life, and was to be bound upon the whole world. The portion of Christianity which could be forced into an agreement with this notion must have been, of necessity, very limited. And when we are told that they regarded Paul as an Antichrist, and received none of the apostolical documents, except a mutilated version of St. Matthew's narrative, we see at once that these Ebionites bore testimony to the preaching of Paul, that Christianity and a covenant of works could not be made to agree ; by losing the Gospel, while mixing it with Rabbinism. In the end this sect fell off into some of the wildest fancies of the Docetæ, and disappeared by being confused with other heretics.

Since then, God's declaration is as legible as though written in the skies, that no one shall be a Christian and a Jew at the same time. No Jew, converted to Christianity, would now think of living in the way Paul did ; it may be from mistaken motives ; but he still, by his conduct, reveals God's will, that the Law of Moses, freed from the traditionary errors, shall not be observed, until Palestine is again the heritage of Israel.

CHAPTER IX.

ISRAEL IN THE FUTURE.

THE destruction of Jerusalem was the sign of the Son of man, as our Lord Himself predicted. The present condition of the theocratic people is the surest and most forcible evidence of the Divine origin of the Mosaic Law, and of the identity of Jesus with Jehovah. If every other testimony were wanting ;—if men, now for the first time, discovered the roll of the Law, and any one of the Evangelists, as they are discovering the records of Nineveh and Egypt,—digging them out of a grave which has been closed for many centuries ;—an inquiring mind, led to peruse them by the light of history, to compare them with the actual Hebrew race, would thank God for so powerfully convincing him of these wonderful truths.

Such an evidence is simply this :—A very ancient book claims to be the title-deed of a right, which a particular people were to have to a well-known land ; subject to the condition that they should never reject Jehovah. Another book professes to be an account of that people refusing to acknowledge a certain Prophet, who declared Himself to be an incarnation of Jehovah. Unquestioned history calmly points out to us this very people turned out of that land, and undergoing the curses threatened for violation of their terms of Covenant. And if Jesus was not Jehovah ; if the Mosaic Law was a forgery ;

which link in this evidence is the false one? Who shall show cause why this testimony is not worthy of every degree of credit?

And here we might well stop, content with having demonstrated the need of both Covenants; and having, it is hoped, supplied a means whereby whatever belongs to either one, may not improperly be given to the other. But a question starts up before us, which we cannot slight. Shall this marvellous people ever be restored to the land, which for them alone flowed with milk and honey? A question which, on the one side, has been rashly answered by over-hasty interpreters of prophecy; or, on the other side, has been altogether disregarded. I cannot avoid the conclusion that a great deal of this inconsiderateness or neglect has arisen from the usual misapprehension of Judaism. And if our previous considerations have tended to place the Law on a more solid ground; they may also, possibly, bring forth this hope of a Jewish restoration into a clearer light than hitherto it has been regarded in.

We must take care, however, not to confound absolute and manifest truth, with only obscure prediction or probable surmise. That Judaism was once, and therefore still is, compatible with Christianity, is beyond any doubt. That the Jews *may* again be a theocratic people, under the Law and obedient to the Gospel, is but repeating the same truth. That the Jews shall regain all they have lost, when they acknowledge Jehovah's last revelation to them; and that nothing imaginable can replace them in Canaan, if they are not Christianized, seems to me like

saying, that God is true. But whether they actually will become disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, is a very different question, depending upon the conduct of free agents; the solution of which none but the Father can, with certainty, foresee. Let us therefore be cautious how we change our hopes or suspicions into dogmatic and absolute assertions.

One thing is to be noticed, as of especial importance in this inquiry, that the book of the Covenant does not declare the final and irreversible cessation of Judaism. On the contrary, it always takes for granted, that when the Law should at any time be violated, the power should rest with the nation to have that Law restored. In the marvellous passage of Deuteronomy, beginning with the 28th, and ending with the 30th chapters; after an ample description of the *temporal and territorial* curses to come upon the people, “if Israel would not observe to do all the words of this Law that are written in this book^a ;”—which curses, being conditional, have been pouring out upon Israel ever since the conditions were infringed;—yet even after all this, the Lawgiver declares, with a very remarkable minuteness, “If thou shalt call these things to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice, according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart and with all thy soul; that then the Lord will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations,

^a Deut. xxviii. 58.

whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee; and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it: and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers ^a.”

If we are convinced that the Jews actually have suffered the evils denounced; if there is no doubt that Israel, since the rejection of Jehovah in Jesus, has been all but exterminated^b; and the remnant scattered from the one end of the earth even unto the other^c;—if, in glaring reality, this people has become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword among all nations whither the Lord has led them^d;—if people of all colours, languages and creeds have united in denying to the Jews any ease or rest for the sole of their feet;—if Israel himself knows that the Lord has given to him a trembling heart and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind; and his life has hung in doubt, so that in the morning he has said, Would God it were even; and at even, Would God it were morning^e;—and if it is clearly announced, in the same passage, immediately afterwards, that when Israel shall repent, the Lord his God shall bring him back into the land which his fathers possessed^f;—who can dare to trifle away such manifest assertions, or can presume to doubt that if Israel *nationally* acknowledge Jehovah’s last appearance, that is, become Christians, then Israel must again be the theocratic people?

^a Deut. xxx. 1–5.

^b xxviii. 62.

^c Verse 64.

^d Verse 37.

^e Verses 65–67.

^f xxx. 1–14.

To transfer this prediction solely to the Babylonish captivity is futile. The curses and the woes herein uttered fit the Roman much better than the Chaldean dispersion. And even if they did not, the curses are denounced for every violation, now as then; are not the blessings promised for *any repentance*? The spirit of the Lord, which spake by Moses, does not say that these things shall come to pass only once; but at any time, disobedience shall be punished, and obedience rewarded, *territorially*.

Yet more wonderfully does the prophet Zechariah speak of a dispersion and of a gathering. He saw Zerubbabel's temple rise^a; and therefore his prediction of the spoiling of Jerusalem must refer to the last destruction. After this destruction the holy city was to be a cup of trembling unto all the people round about; a burdensome stone for them; such that all that burdened themselves with it should be cut in pieces^b. It was to be after all nations had been gathered against Jerusalem; after the city had been taken, and the people gone into captivity, that the Lord should go forth and fight against those nations; and then the name of the Lord shall be one; and men shall dwell in Jerusalem; and there shall be no more utter destruction; but it shall be safely inhabited^c.

History has been written in vain, if we do not read the exact and literal fulfillment of the first part of this prophecy. Since the exile of Israel, Canaan has been at once the bone of contention, and the burdensome stone to all who have possessed her. It was in Syria that the

^a Ezra v. 1.

^b Zech. xii. 2, 3.

^c xiv. 1-11.

Roman destroyers of Jerusalem were wounded by the Persians, and vanquished by the Moslems. Here it was that the two children of Judaism, the cross and the crescent, contended for superiority. Here it will be, in all human probability, that the great powers of Europe will meet. And has it not been a burdensome stone? Placed successively between the Roman and the Persian, the Greek and the Saracen, the Turk and his rebellious vassal, the Russian and his potent rival, it has ever ruined those who fought across it; and it does not require a great amount of political foresight, to guess at the destructive issue to those who shall again venture to burden themselves with it.

It is the most violent and unnatural interpretation which strives to refer these predictions *figuratively* to the present aspect of the church. No one can find in the state of Christendom, anything which may, with the most unscrupulous straining of metaphor, be supposed to be the fulfillment of these prophecies. It is indeed true, that Zechariah, like all the other prophets, saw, in his ecstatic vision, the blending together of two things, the spiritual and the theocratic kingdoms, the first and the second advents; but, unless we be disposed to set aside the plain rules of language, both Moses and Zechariah (with whom the other prophets agree^a) speak of a restoration quite as literal, quite as Jewish, quite as territorial, as the dispersion. Nor would any one have seen

^a Let the reader take especial notice, that I single out Zechariah from the other prophets, only that it may be quite certain that the prediction does not refer to the Babylonish exile.

in these passages any but a theocratic fulfillment, had not the doctrinal obscured the grammatical interpretation. It has been the mistaken notion of Judaism, incapable of perceiving how the old and the new Covenants are compatible with each other, that has made the Hebrew prophets almost as useless to Christians, as they have been, from precisely the same cause, to Jews.

In these prophets, every one has noticed that the visions of Christ's kingdom are clothed in a Jewish dress. In fact, the constant idea with them, and most remarkably with the evangelical Isaiah, is that Israel shall become the first nation of the Messiah's empire, and that Gentiles shall come to their light. And although the darker and more secret side of the picture, the frustration of the theocratic kingdom through Israel's infidelity, is sometimes also beheld by the sorrowful prophet, yet this does not tarnish the brighter aspect, except in the same way as when Moses showed to Israel life on the one hand and death on the other. Both blessings and curses are conditional on the actions of free men. God knew, what the God-inspired prophet did not know, which of the two conditions should be satisfied.


It is evident that the idea of the kingdom in Christ's earlier discourses was the same as that which occurs in the prophets. He implied that Israel was still to be the theocratic people, and that Gentiles should be brought into the church through their means. In the Sermon on the Mount, which, whether it be regarded as a single discourse or not, sufficiently illustrates the tone of His preaching in the beginning of His ministry, He com-

pares the Jews to a light ; to their own city Jerusalem, which was set upon a hill ; and to salt for the seasoning of the earth. And while He also teaches that this salt had lost his savour, He holds out hopes that again it would be restored, if the Jews would listen to Him.

It was under this idea, namely that Israel must first be converted, that He preached only to the circumcision. The exceptions, in the cases of the centurion and the woman of Canaan, were extraordinary, and due to the singular faith of these individuals. In the same sense He told the woman of Samaria that salvation was of the Jews ; and when He sent out His disciples to propagate His doctrines, even although the hostility to Him had commenced, and He warned them of the opposition they would, in consequence, have to encounter, yet He straitly charged them not to go to any but Israel. Nor was this restriction removed until His death had closed the divine offer to the once holy nation.

From the earlier to the later parables of our Lord, we see the ideality of the kingdom undergo a remarkable change. At first the kingdom of heaven was to embrace all men ; was to last from that time forth ; was to be successful. Afterwards, men refused to receive it ; it was shut up ; to be delayed till the bridegroom came ; or the man returned from the distant country ; or the Son of man appeared in glory.

In fact, Christ announced his mission at the first to be that of a reformer of *Israel*. He, the incarnation of Jehovah, could not be recognized as such, while the Jews clung to their obstinate perversion of the Law, and for-



getfulness of the prophets. The opposition to Him began, because He rebuked the errors which prevented the true understanding of Judaism. It spread into murderous hostility only by degrees ; of which indications are given at several places, as in the eighth and three following chapters of Matthew. At length, when it became more decided, as in the twelfth chapter of Matthew, and the sixth of John, the language and conduct of Jesus assumed a harsher tone. Before, He spake plainly ; now, in parables. Before, His words were gracious, and He went about doing good ; now, He preached in public only with stern rebukes, and walked usually in secret. Before, He discoursed of the Jews, as a light to the Gentiles ; now, He declared that the kingdom was taken from them.

Men are loth to adopt such a view as this, because it seems to represent Jesus beginning to preach in accordance with Jewish prejudice, and ending with more spiritual doctrines. But the theocratic idea with the prophets and the Redeemer essentially differed from that with the Rabbis. The prophets represent evangelical doctrines as independent of the Law, and to be embraced equally by Jews and Gentiles ; while still the Jews were to be distinguished by their Covenant, as the first in the kingdom, and the organs for divine communications to mankind. This was also the representation of Jesus ; with which the Rabbis would not agree, for they had determined that the Law was the same as the Gospel. Nor let us be startled by a view which makes God's plan changed. In all His revelations to man, He speaks as

if man obeyed; and when man refuses obedience, we never question His foresight, because the rebellion seems to frustrate His intentions. There is no greater difficulty in the scheme of the kingdom being altered, in consequence of the perversity of those to whom it was proposed, than there is in the march of the Israelites being turned, when they refused to go and conquer Canaan.

To my own apprehension, Christ very distinctly announced that *the kingdom of heaven was frustrated*; nor do I understand the meaning of His rebukes to the Scribes, that they prevented men from entering into it, if His first mission was in no way interfered with. Doctrinal prejudice, unable to read this plain teaching, cannot receive in its first and obvious sense, the declaration of our Saviour, "The kingdom of heaven is violently opposed, and violent opposers snatch it away^a," and resorts to all kinds of forced and ungrammatical interpretations, in order to see in the words anything rather than their true meaning. Our English translators, with great wisdom, used the very wide word "suffereth violence," in this passage, in order not to spoil what they did not explain. The general sense given by modern commentators is, that the kingdom cannot be entered except by the energetic, who were at that time making a rush into the kingdom^b. But it is very clear that this

^a Matt. xi. 12. Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιάσται ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν.

^b The word βιάζομαι (passive) is not to be found elsewhere in the Scriptures. It occurs frequently in profane authors, but in every passage it has the meaning of being *opposed and driven away*. I

cannot be the meaning, for it would be in direct opposition to the constant lament of Jesus, that those who

find no instance of its being used for *being entered*, still less for *entered with energy* (in a good sense). The following are some of these passages:—

Thucydides (i. 2). "The emigrants readily deserted their own territories, being driven away (*βιαζόμενοι*) by continually increasing numbers."

Idem (vii. 38). "So that there might be a safe refuge in case any ship should be driven away (*βιάζοιτο*)."

Pindar *Nemea* (ix. 34). "They were no longer rulers, having been driven away (*βιασθέντες*) by sedition."

Homer, Iliad (O. 727 & II. 102). "Ajax no longer remained, for he was driven away (*βιάζετο*) by darts." See also *Λ*. 575.

I have taken pains to examine all the passages I could, where *βιάζομαι* (passive) occurs, and in every one of them there is the idea of *oppression* and *removal*. Therefore the first sense of *ἡ βασιλεία βιάζεται* (such as we must adopt, if nothing appears to the contrary) is, *the kingdom of heaven is resisted*.

The word *βιαστής* is almost an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*. It is not found anywhere else, except (it is said) in Philo. *βιάστικός νόμος* is given in Stephanus as a *coercive law*. The Doric form of the word, *βιαράς*, occurs, as an adjective, more than once in Pindar, as—

Pythia, i. 18. *βιαράς Ἀρης*, the violent Mars.

Pythia, i. 81. *χερσὶ βιαραὶ*, the strong-handed (as contrasted with *σοφοί*).

Pythia, vi. 28. *Ἀντίλοχος βιαράς*, the brave Antilochus.

The most natural interpretation of *βιασται* in Matthew (coming directly after *βιάζονται*) is *βιάζοντες*. It is inconceivable that two words, of the same root, should come together with different meanings. It has been objected against taking *βιασται* (for *βιάζοντες*) in the sense of *energetic people*, that this sense would require *οἱ βιασται*, as denoting the whole of one class, for which there is not sufficient authority from the Codices (see Middleton on the Greek Article). This objection is of no force in the sense I am seeking to give to the passage; for, although *opposers* snatch away the kingdom, it does not follow that *all opposers* do so.

And this leads us to consider the word *ἀρπάζουσιν*, for which we have no occasion to go to profane authors, for it meets us frequently

heard the Gospel did not embrace it; and to what He says almost immediately afterwards, that babes (not very energetic people) were those who knew His doctrine, and that His yoke was easy and His burden light. This sense, moreover, is ungrammatical, as I have shown in the note below.

Another sense sought to be attached to the passage is, that *βιαστής* refers to the violent lives of the publicans and others, who chiefly embraced the Gospel. But this sense not only disjoins the etymology of *βιαστής* from that of *βιάζομαι*, but makes our Saviour say, that the kingdom of heaven was adapted only for bad men. Olshausen, indeed, removes the etymological objection, and connects *βιάζεται* with *βιάσται* in a *bad* sense, as though the kingdom of heaven was entered in the manner of a *βιαστής*. But apart from the forced nature of this interpretation, there is no evidence to show that the words ever bear such a sense. If Olshausen intends that the kingdom of heaven was *badly* received, although this is not the exact meaning, yet it amounts to much the same as what I am contending for, that the kingdom was frustrated^a.

in the New Testament. In addition to the passage in question (Matt. xi. 12), the following are, I believe, the whole of the places where it occurs:—Matt. xiii. 19; John vi. 15, x. 12, 28, 29; Acts viii. 39, xxiii. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Jude 23; Rev. xii. 5. In all of these citations, except *perhaps* in John vi. 15, the word signifies a *snatching away*. And therefore we have ample authority for concluding, that in the passage under consideration, there is the same meaning of *removal*. Consequently the saying is, "The kingdom of heaven is resisted, and some who resist it snatch it away." In other words, the kingdom is *partly* frustrated.

^a Olshausen, Commentary on Matt. xi. 12.

There is yet another sense given by Raphelius, that the kingdom of heaven is forcibly entered, *in spite of* the Scribes and Pharisees. The same objections occur here which press against the last-noticed interpretation, namely that it is in opposition to the usual meaning of the words, and also to the teaching of Jesus^a.

I do not understand why the interpretation I have given to the passage, namely that the kingdom is resisted and driven away, does not suggest itself at once as the only probable one. Commentators seem loth to adopt it, because they suppose it must be exactly the same as in the parallel passage of Luke, "The kingdom of heaven is preached, and every one strives to press into it^b." Raphelius has collected sufficient authority for

^a Raphelii Annot. in Matt. xi. 12.

^b Luke xvi. 16. The word βιάζομαι (middle) is usually equivalent to βιάζω, *to resist or oppress*, as in Thucyd. iv. 20, viii. 53; Plut. ix. 97. In such a phrase as βιάσασθαι τὴν φυλακὴν, the meaning is *carcerem summovere*, not *perrumpere*.

The construction adopted by Luke, βιάζομαι εἰς, is infrequent; and although, on reference to the instances adduced by Raphelius, we must not hesitate to agree to the sense of *striving to get in*; yet he has not observed, what is palpable from the instances themselves, that βιάζομαι εἰς only means *endeavouring to enter*, not *actually entering*: as τὸν Ἡλιόδωρον Εὐμενῆς καὶ Ἀρταλος εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν βιαζόμενον ἐκβάλλουσι (Appian De Bel. Syr., page 116 of Stephens's folio edition, 1592).

Luke could not mean that *every one* did enter the kingdom; but that *all* who strove to get in were *prevented* (as at xi. 52). No one, who looks at the two passages of Matt. xi. 12 and Luke xvi. 16, can avoid the conclusion that Luke had Matthew before him; and, as is almost always the case when the kingdom is mentioned, changes the words, so as to suit the idea of the kingdom, which, in Luke's time, was no longer a theocratic one. If we be convinced of this, we must so reconcile the passages, as, without making them speak in contra-

giving to the passage in Luke the meaning of forcing an entrance; yet, as I have observed in the note below, there is no reason for supposing an entrance *effected*, but that people were *striving* to enter the kingdom. And if this passage is not to contradict what Luke reports Jesus as saying, that the Scribes closed up the kingdom, it must mean that they strove *in vain*. Therefore Luke really means the same thing as Matthew; only Matthew does not so decidedly declare that the kingdom was altogether prevented, as Luke does; but that Jesus was lamenting how much His opponents were tending to frustrate it.

These considerations leave us no room to doubt, that the original idea in Christ's preaching was, that the kingdom was a theocratic one; the Jews were still to be the Covenant people, receptacles of the successive incarnations of Deity; and through their means, the other idea of the kingdom, namely the spiritual one, was to come forth. Matthew, whose Gospel bears certain indications of being written before the disciples had abandoned their theocratic principles, represents Christianity under the same Jewish aspect as the prophets, and Christ in His earlier discourses, had done. Luke, on the contrary, writing when the theocratic idea had almost vanished, and being therefore careful to round off any

diction to each other, to assign a reasonable cause why Luke did not repeat the same words. As we shall see in the next note, Luke always represents the *external* kingdom as non-existent; and therefore he strengthened what Matthew said, that it was in consequence of the resistance to the kingdom that it had not been established in the predicted form.

Jewish peculiarities, which were prominent in Matthew, and still lingered in Mark, usually speaks of the kingdom as either within a man, or as something distant^a. And in one place, peculiar to himself, when the disciples asked Jesus whether the kingdom of God should immediately appear, the parable of the pounds was delivered, for the purpose of teaching them that it was deferred for a long period^b.

^a Luke xvii. 21 ; xiii. 28.

^b Luke xix. 11-27. Matthew gives the Lord's prayer, according to the *first* idea of Christ's preaching—"Thine *is* the kingdom." Luke, writing under the idea of the kingdom being postponed, omits this expression.

I may observe here what great probability there is that Luke had Matthew's Gospel before him:—1st. It is not conceivable that if Matthew's was already published, Luke should have been ignorant of it. 2ndly. His preface refers to some genuine accounts of Christ's life by eye-witnesses, which may well mean the Gospel of Matthew among others. 3rdly. All the passages verbally alike in the two accounts are not Luke's own words, for they abound in Hebraisms, from which Luke's composition is free ; and the changes which he introduces are accounted for by the altered circumstances of those for whom Luke wrote (on this subject see Townson's Discourses on the Four Gospels). 4thly. If any one is convinced that some passages in the two Gospels are from the same source, there seems no reason why Matthew should not write originally of what he had himself witnessed, and every reason why Luke should have copied from Matthew.

The truth seems to me to be this. When the church was entirely Jewish, and the disciples were still filled with the original theocratic idea, Matthew's Gospel was written ; and it evidently just expresses that idea. The type of this Gospel was James. Gradually this view of the kingdom faded away, and the spiritual view alone remained ; when a new Gospel was needed, in order to represent Christianity on its catholic side. Hence Luke, while transferring whole passages from Matthew, modifies any expressions relating to the kingdom.—Paul was the exemplar of this Gospel.—Mark's narrative holds an

When once we suppose the idea of the kingdom and Christ's preaching changed, we understand many difficulties which at first are embarrassing. The disciples were all offended and surprised in the *later* part of His ministry; many went back, and one sold Him to death. All this very clearly marks a disappointment consequent on their Master not being now what He was formerly. It is beyond belief that this disappointment was due to their looking for a warrior as their Messiah. There is no evidence to show that such an expectation was universal among the Jews of that age; still less to fix upon the Twelve the imputation of being impressed with such a hope. They could not, *at the first*, have supposed the poor carpenter of Nazareth to be really a great warrior. Their views of the Messiah were those of the prophets, as a theocratic, not a worldly king; and their disappointment was the effect of not having sufficiently attended to the mournful predictions in the Old Testament, that this first idea of the kingdom would be frustrated. And it was for this reason, that before the disciples were roused from the dejection they were in, these predictions were carefully laid before them*.

How decidedly also does Christ's plan seem changed in the ministry of the Apostles! Of the original twelve we know really nothing whatever, after the descent of

intermediate place, not only in the order of its composition, and its place in the canon, but in its ideas also. The theocratic view of Christianity is in a state of transition. Hence we readily acquiesce in the account which assigns this Gospel to the superintendence of Peter, who stood between James and Paul.

* See Luke xxiv. 19-27; Acts ii. 23, iii. 18, viii. 26-35.

the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, except a very short account of the chief three, Peter, James and John. And of these, James was soon removed; Peter was not the head authority even among the Jews; at Jerusalem he was subordinate to James*, as at Antioch he was to Paul. John, after the first few days, seems to have disappeared altogether; reserved till the first age of Christianity had gone by, to communicate a startling revelation concerning the re-establishment of the kingdom; and to give the seal of his testimony against a destructive heresy. It was Paul, called to be an Apostle after Christ's death, *one born out of due time*, who placed Christianity on its present ground. And therefore, if the inspired history represents the guides of Christendom, not such as Jesus originally chose, we are justified in saying, that the plan of the kingdom was no longer the same.

We are now living in the frustrated state of Christianity. We do not see the bright visions of the prophets, because of the infidelity of the Jews. Nor will these visions ever be fulfilled until they turn to the Lord, and become again a theocratic community. And this leads us to the consideration, whether Christ left to us any promise of things returning to their originally intended state. I think there are some of His expressions, very clearly intimating that the theocratic kingdom shall one day be restored; in the same sense as

* I take for granted that James, the bishop of Jerusalem, was not one of the twelve. In 1 Cor. xv. 5 & 7, he is distinguished from them. He was the brother of the Lord, and therefore not an original disciple (John vii. 5). See the ninth chapter of the highly interesting introduction to Olshausen's Commentary.

Moses and all the prophets speak of Israel being again the Covenant people.

The Old Testament closes with a very remarkable prediction of Elias coming before the day of the Lord; which prediction is connected, by Christ Himself, with the dawn of the New Testament, the preaching of John Baptist. Now every one understands the office of Elias to have been that of a *restorer*; as the office of Moses was that of a *founder*. And if we have unquestioned authority for saying that John exercised this office, let me ask, what did he *restore*? The ordinary view makes him *introduce* the Gospel, and *destroy* the Law. But this was not to act with the spirit and power of Elias.

Again, the peculiar office of Elias was to restore *the Law of Moses*, which had fallen into desuetude in the days of Ahab; and, that we may be under no doubt in this matter, Malachi joins the promise of Elias immediately with a charge to the Jews not to neglect this Law. "Remember ye the Law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgements. Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet^a."

If this prediction meant anything at all, it meant that before the advent of Messiah, the Mosaic Law should be restored to a proper understanding, after having decayed. And if the principles I have advocated in this book are correct, the Rabbinical interpretation of the Law, turning it into a covenant of works, and seeking for individual justification by its means, was a total misunderstanding,

^a Malachi iv. 4, 5.

and a virtual abolition of it. When John preached so emphatically *Repentance*, and told the Jews that their merely being the children of Abraham gave them no title to Divine favour, he strove to restore a true conception of the Law ; and therefore he came in the spirit and power of Elias.

But now mark ! The Jewish nation did not receive John. He did not complete this office. He would have been Elias, if he had not been rejected. Our Saviour very plainly declares this, in concluding His summary of John's character, when He says, " If ye will receive *him* (John), this is Elias, which was for to come*." But farther on, when Elias appeared with Moses and Christ at the Transfiguration, and the disciples considered such an appearance as the best means of satisfying the Scribes that Jesus was Christ ; what does our Saviour mean by saying, " Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things," in answer to the question of the disciples, and for a reason why they should not tell the vision to any man ? There was to be another coming of Elias ; a restoration of the Jewish Law should take place.

* Matt. xi. 14—*ei θέλετε δέξασθαι*—our English translators have rendered " if ye will receive *it*," namely the announcement. But this is not according to the usage of the word in the New Testament.

Δέχομαι is used, almost without exception, for receiving *a person*, as at Matt. x. 14, xviii. 5 ; Mark ix. 37 ; Luke ix. 48 ; Rom. xvi. 2, &c.

The proper word for receiving *a thing*, is *λαμβάνω*, as at Matt. x. 8 ; Mark x. 30 ; Luke xx. 47 ; John v. 41 & 44 ; 1 John iii. 22, & v. 9, &c.

If the passage above meant *understanding*, the word to be used would have been *χωρέω*, as at Matt. xix. 11.

Although *δέχομαι* does sometimes occur in the sense of receiving *a thing*, yet it will be found to be *a thing personified*, as at Mark x. 15.

Immediately afterwards He declares, that although Elias's coming to restore all things was future, yet that Elias had already come in the person of John Baptist; but he had not restored all things, *because they knew him not*, or would not receive him.

And this rejection of the Baptist is joined by our Lord with rejection of Himself, not only in this place^a, but afterwards in His answer to the question of the priests, as to the authority for His acting as He did^b. Had the Jews listened to John and to Jesus, on the right understanding of the Mosaic Law, John would then have been the predicted Elias, the errors which induced the opposition to Jesus would have been removed, and He would have been the theocratic King of the Jews. But Jerusalem knew not the time of her visitation; and the kingdom of heaven was frustrated. Only the spiritual kingdom remained^c. While yet our Saviour clearly announced that a second coming is to be expected, preceded by the coming of Elias, such as John would have been, if he had been listened to; that is, before the restoration of the kingdom, some one like Elias, or some influence similar to his, shall recall the Jews to the proper understanding of their Law; and then, if God is true, both these things must come to pass: the Jews shall be re-established as

^a Matt. xvii. 12.

^b Mark xi. 27-33.

^c To the last, even when rejected, Jesus claimed to have the right of being the King of Jerusalem. His riding into the city with hosannas can have no other import. On His trial before Pilate, He admitted that He was *King of the Jews*; though not a worldly king, such as would interfere with Cæsar's subordinate jurisdiction. He was theocratic King, above the earthly governor.

the Covenant people ; and again the incarnate Jehovah shall appear to them. All this conclusion is built upon the whole of our previous reasoning.

The last words of our Lord in public were a lamentation over Jerusalem for having refused to receive Him ; and a warning, that *in consequence*, their house should be left unto them desolate ; accompanied by a prediction that He would not come again, until they (the Jews) should say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord : that is, He announced two events ; 1st, the destruction of Jerusalem, *because* the Jews had rejected Him ; and 2ndly, His coming again, when they should be ready to acknowledge Him^a.

The disciples thereupon asked of Him, when these two events were to be expected :—1st. When shall these things be ? and 2ndly, What is the sign of Thy coming, and of the completion of the present dispensation^b ? In answer to the first, they were told exactly when the end of the city was to be looked for ; even within that generation ; it was a fixed event, the determined punishment for committed sin ; the eagles that had come to the carcase. But that other day and hour, the end of the infidelity of the Jews, and the second coming, no man knows ; it is a secret with Him who alone foresees the actions of

^a Matt. xxiii. 37–39.

^b Matt. xxiv. 3. *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*. *Αἰὼν*, even when it means *the world*, always implies the *duration of the world*. The first and most obvious meaning is *age, dispensation*. In one of the parables, the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* (Matt. xiii. 39 & 40) appears as an equivalent expression for *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* (ver. 24). In the same parable another word, *κόσμος*, is used for *the world* (ver. 38).

free agents. We must watch for that day, but no one can exactly determine when it will be. And so little were the disciples to understand that their Master might not return, that they were warned against being misled by false Christs; which warning would have been entirely needless, if He had said that He never should come again, until the material world was dissolved in fire^a.

And, at the same time, I think it evident that our Lord gave to them, and through them to us, a sufficient declaration that every Christ would be a false Christ, until the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, or the re-establishment of Israel. For, at the last, when about to be parted from His followers on the Mount Olivet, He was still pressed by them to say whether He was then going to restore the kingdom to Israel. His answer was the same as He had given before, that the Father alone knew an event which depended upon the free will of the Jews^b.

And if so decided an obscurity is thrown over this longed-for day, let us beware how we presume to know what *none* of the angels know. Our duty is to have our loins girded, and our lights burning; to hope and pray; but not to prophesy. We cannot therefore say with any degree of certainty, when we are to look for the restoration of Israel to their Covenant and land, and for a continuation of the Christophanies. Our expectation must depend altogether upon the probability of the Jewish nation being Christianized. Individual conversions amount

^a Matt. xxiv. 36-51.

^b Acts i. 6, 7. Matthew, in relating the same conversation, still calls the expected restoration, *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* (xxviii. 20).

to nothing ; and indeed the wonderful and embarrassing difficulty with which such conversions are attended, seems to indicate that the promised evangelizing of the Jews is to be, not of individuals, but of the mass.

I desire to speak with more than usual caution, when I refer to a change in the position of the Jews, which might be supposed to lead to their restoration. The fault which induced their rejection of Christ, and their own fearful punishment, was exclusiveness and unsociality. They hated the Gentiles ; and let us mark the unerring retribution of God ;—the Gentiles have hated them. If the signs of the present times are to be relied on, the Gentiles are beginning to remove the barrier between the circumcision and themselves ; and if this be a cessation of Israel's doom, does it not seem as if the judgement were not required, as if Israel were about to repent ?

It is remarkable, that, while the Mosaic Law is addressed to an eminently agricultural people, the modern Jews are altogether commercial. They have themselves revealed God's will, that this Law is impracticable out of Palestine ;—and the revelation is none the less clear, whether we suppose them to have acted consciously in refusing, or unconsciously in being refused, territorial possession among the Gentiles ; *having no rest for the sole of their feet* ; and therefore abiding in a state more fit for departure to Canaan, than if they had connected themselves with the land in which they sojourn.

Nor let it be objected, that a restoration of Israel would be unprofitable ; or that we are actually in the

condition which Isaiah foresaw, and Christ promised. Can any man detect in the present state of Christendom the faintest, or most figurative realization of the predicted glory of Messiah's kingdom? Probably in no period of man's history could there be found so little appearance, as there is now in Europe, of nation not lifting up sword against nation, and of every man sitting under his own vine and his own fig-tree.

For how many years have men been vainly striving to grasp the idea of the kingdom or church! and, as though in mockery of such efforts, the more exact and perfect the ideality of the church is made to be, the wider departure is there from evangelical truth. This bewildering fact is as surely God's revelation that the kingdom is not set up, because the King has not returned from His distant journey; as the prevalence and rankling of vice and worldliness is the sign of the weeping of the Bridegroom's friends, when He is taken away.

And if you, O reader, have ever felt the dreary want, of seeing an appearance of Divinity, do not slight the hope of Israel's theocratic restoration, which would lead to such an appearance. The ultimate design in setting apart the Jewish people, was that they might receive the successive Theophanies; the sensible manifestations of Jehovah. And indeed we can scarcely conceive how an incarnation of Deity could benefit mankind, unless first made to one people, prepared for being the organs of such revelations.

The first idea we have of God, is as God the Father, the God of the Deists, an inconceivable, inapproachable

Being. But few can rest content with this idea. Man must strive to get to God: and Religion is the name we give to the effort. Yet what becomes of religion, if God does not present Himself at any of the points at which perception can be induced? Who imagines that pure Deism can become a religion? Man will have his visible God; and if a true manifestation be not found, he makes images and Llamas.

It was the especial privilege of the Israelites, that as long as their Covenant existed, the Theophanies should be made to them. The inspiration of the seer depended upon his direct personal intercourse with Christ, whom we call the second Person, or the Son. When it is so constantly repeated that the word of the Lord came to the prophet, both he and the people knew that the communication he had to make was owing neither to imposture nor enthusiasm. Even Ahab was persuaded that he could not inquire of Jehovah through any but Micaiah. This open vision was, therefore, no illusion of a morbid fancy; it was a well-admitted privilege of the seer, that he brought the message from Jehovah, the objective God, to the nation of Israel. These Theophanies have been often interrupted; in Eli's time, and in the days of the Rabbis, they ceased; they were renewed in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; and since then have been only longed after for a period of eighteen centuries.

The interruption of these sensible manifestations of Deity has never abolished the inward subjective perception of God, in His character of Spirit working upon man's spirit; called, in theology, the Holy Ghost, or the

third Person. In other words, the suspension of the theocratic kingdom does not destroy the spiritual kingdom. The purpose of every revelation, the end of every discipline, the design of man's existence, is that he may, in time, apprehend God's Spirit with his own. And who ventures to say that the lesson is either easy or short?

I have more than a suspicion that the inspiration of some of the early disciples must have been consequent upon their continuing to see the Lord. Paul refers to his own visions as of frequent occurrence, and only refrains from dwelling upon them lest he should appear to boast. The answer of the Lord to his prayer seems to have been not merely a subjective one^a. And he grounded his claims to apostleship upon the fact that he had *seen* the Lord Jesus^b.

It was to this re-appearance of Himself, no doubt, that the Redeemer alluded, when He promised another *Paraclete* to His disciples after His death. It is beyond probability that He spoke, either of giving to them the power of working miracles, or the spiritual working of the Holy Ghost upon men's hearts. For that power existed previously; and man could *at all times* find God in his heart. The *Paraclete* was Christ glorified; who could not come to the disciples until Jesus, the afflicted Christ, died.

^a 2 Cor. xii. 1-9.

^b Compare 1 Cor. xv. 7, 8, with 1 Cor. ix. 1. The sign of an Apostle must have been something more than an acquaintance with Jesus before His death; for many of the early disciples must have seen Him, during the period of His humiliation, who were not Apostles.

And thus the Paraclete was strictly, according to the promise, in Christ's place^a.

Since the destruction of Jerusalem, and the absolute cessation of Judaism, there have been no authenticated Theophanies^b; nor will there be, until Israel is again ready to receive them. Yet how have they been wanted! The recollection of the last remained for some ages with Christians. Then, almost as soon as men began to make the kingdom a visible one; as soon as the state organized the church; there came a thousand years of darkness and barbarism, and virtual heathenism, clothed in a Christian garb. When light burst in, the first attempts to restore the Gospel split the church into fragments. And what has been our condition since that time? We have no Theophany; and while the mass, at our very doors, are, at the best, indifferent; with no religion, and only a negative belief; many thinking minds, as in the days preceding the New Testament, are inclining to a blank Pantheism. Others, like some in that age, rush from this extreme into a childish anthropomorphism; and in their dislike of what is rationalistic, condemn what is reason-

^a Luke calls Christ's first appearance a *παράκλησις* (ii. 25). The dire confusion, in the minds of the Jews, respecting the persons of the Trinity, which led them to believe that, because they were the only people to receive the Christophanies, they were actuated in a higher sense by the Holy Spirit than any others were, has descended to Christian expositors; who see no difference between a subjective and an objective manifestation; between what inspired only a few, and what works equally upon all men's hearts.

^b I here take for granted, what is, I believe, often conceded by modern orthodox Biblical students, that the Apocalypse was written during Nero's persecution. The expressions in xi. 1-2 undoubtedly refer to the Temple as then standing.

